

In presenting the dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from the Georgia Institute of Technology, I agree that the Library of the Institution shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to copy from, or to publish from, this dissertation may be granted by the professor under whose direction it was written, or, in his absence, by the dean of the Graduate Division when such copying or publication is solely for scholarly purposes and does not involve potential financial gain. It is understood that any copying from, or publication of, this dissertation which involves potential financial gain will not be allowed without written permission.

THE ORGANIZATION, OPERATION AND FINANCING OF
METROPOLITAN PLANNING AGENCIES IN THE UNITED STATES

A THESIS

Presented to the
Faculty of the Graduate Division

by

Glen Allan Johnston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of City Planning

Georgia Institute of Technology

July, 1964

GEORGIA TECH LIBRARY

THE ORGANIZATION, OPERATION AND FINANCING OF
METROPOLITAN PLANNING AGENCIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Approved:

[Handwritten signature]
Chairman
[Handwritten signature]
[Handwritten signature]
[Handwritten signature]
[Handwritten signature]

Date Approved by Chairman:

1 July 64

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author extends sincere appreciation to his thesis advisor, Professor Malcolm G. Little, Jr., and to Professor Howard K. Menhinick, both of the Georgia Institute of Technology. Their counsel and guidance have been invaluable. Appreciation is also extended to Mr. Glenn Bennett, Executive Director of the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission, for serving as a member of the thesis committee.

The author is indebted to Miss Natelle Isley, Librarian of the School of Architecture, for her assistance in thesis research and preparation of the bibliography.

The author expresses appreciation to directors of the agencies studied; to many public officials; to staff members of the professional planning societies; and, to university faculty members who assisted in and encouraged the preparation of this study.

This thesis is dedicated to the author's wife. Her assistance, encouragement, and patience have made possible both study in the Graduate City Planning Program and completion of the thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Urban Growth	
The Metropolitan Growth Problem	
Metropolitan Planning	
Metropolitan Planning Agencies Studied	
Purpose and Method of Study	
II. ESTABLISHMENT AND ORGANIZATION OF METROPOLITAN PLANNING AGENCIES	7
Types of Legislation	
State Act Authorizing Intergovernmental Cooperation	
Special Legislation	
General Legislation	
Creation of Metropolitan Planning Commissions	
By Local Governments	
By State Governments	
Membership of Metropolitan Planning Commissions	
State Officials	
Local Officials	
Citizen Members	
Meetings of Metropolitan Planning Commissions	
Metropolitan Planning Commission Committees	
Internal Committees	
Citizen Advisory Committee	
Technical Advisory Committee	
III. FINANCING OF METROPOLITAN PLANNING AGENCIES	32
Sources of Revenue	
Special Metropolitan Planning Tax	
Local Governments	
State Governments	
Federal Governments	
Private Contributions	
Payments for Technical Assistance	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	Page
Other Sources	
Expenditure of Funds	
IV. METROPOLITAN PLANNING AGENCY PROGRAMS.	51
Regional Planning	
Preparation of Regional Plans	
Review of Plans	
Assistance to Cooperating Agencies	
Public Information and Education	
Local Planning Assistance	
Technical Assistance	
Consultation Services	
V. METROPOLITAN PLANNING AGENCY STAFF POLICIES.	70
Employment of Agency Staffs	
Staff Organization	
Administration	
Technical Planning	
Salaries	
Employee Benefits	
Insurance	
Retirement	
Leave Benefits	
APPENDIX	89
BIBLIOGRAPHY	101

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Creation of Metropolitan Planning Agencies.	11
2.	Organization of Metropolitan Planning Agencies.	17
3.	Metropolitan Planning Agency Technical Advisory Committees.	31
4.	Metropolitan Planning Agency Sources of Revenue	33
5.	Metropolitan Planning Agency Personal Expenditures.	45
6.	Estimated Metropolitan Planning Agency Program Expenditures.	48
7.	Metropolitan Planning Agencies Required to Prepare Regional Plans.	53
8.	Metropolitan Planning Agencies Authorized to Review Plans .	57
9.	Agencies Receiving Assistance from Metropolitan Planning Agencies	61
10.	Metropolitan Planning Agencies Offering Technical Assistance to Local Governments	66
11.	Number of Employees of Metropolitan Planning Agencies . . .	78
12.	Metropolitan Planning Agency Employee Salaries.	81
13.	Metropolitan Planning Agency Employee Benefits.	85

ABSTRACT

Increased population and economic activity in metropolitan areas has created a need for more effective utilization of land, economy and efficiency in providing governmental services, as well as a need for cooperative efforts by local and State governments in meeting mutual regional problems. Metropolitan planning agencies in many metropolitan areas are providing solutions to area-wide governmental and private problems.

The purpose of this study is to provide planners, public officials and interested citizens with an analysis and evaluation of metropolitan planning agencies.

This study presents an analysis of the establishment, organization, financing, programs, and operations of metropolitan planning agencies. From this analysis, the major benefits and limitations of the agencies are identified. This study points out basic factors which should be considered by public officials in organizing a metropolitan planning agency.

The analysis reveals that:

- (1) most agencies were created by local governments under the provisions of State general enabling legislation;
- (2) commissions are usually composed of elected officials and citizen members representing local governments;
- (3) agencies receive their major financial support from local government payments, and from Federal 701 funds;

- (4) major expenditures are for staff salaries--primarily for regional planning;
- (5) programs identify and recommend solutions to major regional problems and furnish consultation services to local governments;
- (6) staffs are of moderate size; and,
- (7) staff salaries generally are adequate, and a few agencies provide insurance and retirement benefits.

Individual local governments, acting independently, have been unable to solve the political, economic, and social problems of urban regions. A new three level federal system, wherein local, State and Federal governments have certain developmental responsibilities may be able to solve many metropolitan area problems. A metropolitan planning agency can be instrumental in making this three level federal system workable.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The United States has experienced extensive technological, economic, and social changes in this century, particularly in the past two decades. Among those significant changes has been the rapid growth of population in urban areas. This growth has extended beyond municipal, county and state boundaries. It has created problems of concern to local, State and Federal governments.

Urban Growth

The urban growth trend began in the early 1900's, accelerated during and following World War II, and no deceleration is anticipated. In 1960 two-thirds of the national population resided in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. In 1900 the same areas contained only one-third of the national population. From 1950 to 1960 metropolitan areas absorbed 84 per cent of the nation's population growth. Most of this growth occurred in the larger urban areas. By 1980 it is estimated that 80 per cent of the national population will be living in metropolitan areas. Sixty per cent of the population expansion will take place in suburban areas outside the present central cities. Today these "metropolitan rings" are growing seven times more rapidly than the central cities. (1)

Urban growth is a product of the economic and social changes

having their roots in the industrial and technological revolutions. "It is the natural end product of over a century of industrialization accompanied by increased agriculture productivity." (2) Further, the economics of mass housing, the lack of room for expansion in the built up central cities, governmental housing policies, rising personal income, and the automobile have created the phenomenon of urban sprawl.

Urban growth is also the natural result of the economics of the new technology. Employment for vast numbers of people exists in metropolitan areas, which today account for three-fourths of the nation's economic activity.

The Metropolitan Growth Problem

Urban growth and consequent physical development have placed extensive burdens on local governments. Local governments are limited in using their resources to meet the problems of that growth due to:

- (1) fragmented and overlapping governmental units;
- (2) disparities between tax and service boundaries;
- (3) State constitutional and statutory restrictions; and,
- (4) lack of area-wide coordinated planning. (3)

Summarized, the metropolitan growth problem may be defined as "those problems of governmental significance occurring in two or more legally coordinate governmental jurisdictions at the local level which require joint or cooperative action for their most rational solution."

(4) Luther Gulick has written that the primary failure to date " . . . is the failure to work out any comprehensive community program for general development and tackling the major social and economic problems

of the future." (5)

Metropolitan Planning

Metropolitan planning is one attempt to solve the governmental problems created by urban growth which extends beyond local legal boundaries. It has been proposed by political, civic, business, and academic leaders as a partial solution to many of the problems resulting from rapid urban development in metropolitan areas. The President said in his 1961 Housing Message that

The city and its suburbs are interdependent parts of a single community, bound together by the web of transportation and other public utilities and by common economic interests. Bold programs in individual jurisdictions are not enough. Increasingly, community development must be a cooperative venture toward the goals of the metropolitan region as a whole. (6)

Metropolitan planning agencies are concerned with planning for governmental services of area-wide importance. These include planning for:

- (1) land use and transportation;
- (2) utilities, such as water and sewerage;
- (3) recreation and open space; and,
- (4) major urban facilities, such as airports and ports facilities.

The agencies formulate policy to provide a guide for public and private decision making in the metropolitan area. This is accomplished by performing research and developing a general regional plan--the expression of basic policy decisions. Metropolitan planning agencies also coordinate local capital improvement programs, and educate the local

governments and the public to the objectives and benefits of area-wide cooperation.

Summarized, most metropolitan planning agencies serve as instruments for developing a regional consensus on matters of regional development, for achieving intergovernmental cooperation in planning, and for advising local governments on the alternatives of regional development. The agency aids in achieving a community consensus by helping the metropolitan area to understand itself, not as a group of individual jurisdictions, but as a community of diverse interests facing many common problems.

Metropolitan Planning Agencies Studied

For purposes of this study a metropolitan planning agency is defined as an official (authorized by State or Federal legislation) planning agency serving a number of local governments in a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area composed of two or more counties.

Excluded from consideration in this thesis are single county planning agencies, joint city-county planning agencies, "regional" planning agencies serving a number of counties which lack a high degree of urbanization, and unofficial privately financed agencies. There are several reasons for this.

The more complex problems of government arise in the multi-county areas. With only one county, although there may be a number of governmental units, there is one level of government which can coordinate the governmental functions within its jurisdiction. Secondly, the primary governmental problems arise in highly urbanized areas: thus the elimi-

nation of "regional" agencies serving predominantly rural counties. Finally, the private agencies, with few exceptions, have not been able to deal effectively with the planning problems in metropolitan areas. This may be due to their lack of official status and their existence independent of local governments.

One agency serving only a single county metropolitan area is included. This study deals with the Metropolitan Dade County Department of Planning since it is the only metropolitan planning agency in the United States operating under a metropolitan government.

In the Washington, D. C. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area three agencies are included. They are the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the National Capital Regional Planning Council, and the Northern Virginia Planning and Economic Development Commission. Although these agencies serve all or part of the Washington, D. C. metropolitan area, their programs and organization justify their consideration. The other agencies serve separate metropolitan areas.

Purpose and Method of Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate and evaluate the organization, operation, and financing of multi-jurisdictional metropolitan planning agencies in the United States.

This study is based upon extensive reading on the subject, an analysis of Federal, State, and local legislation and agency publications, correspondence with the agencies studied, and interviews with the directors of selected agencies.

The following chapters deal with the establishment and organization, financing, programs, and staff policies of metropolitan planning agencies.

CHAPTER II
ESTABLISHMENT AND ORGANIZATION OF
METROPOLITAN PLANNING AGENCIES

This chapter is an analysis of the establishment and organization of metropolitan planning agencies. It includes an analysis of the types of Federal, State, and local legislation used to establish the agencies. Also discussed are the provisions of that legislation and agency procedural regulations and practices concerning the creation, membership, meetings, and committees of metropolitan planning agencies.

Types of Legislation

Of the 22 metropolitan planning agencies studied, one was established by Congress under the provisions of Public Law 592 (National Capital Regional Planning Council) (7) and 21 were established under the provisions of State legislation. Of these, 17 were created by local governments:

- (1) one under the provisions of a State act authorizing inter-governmental cooperation;
- (2) one by local ordinance under the provisions of a county charter;
- (3) twelve under the provisions of state general planning enabling legislation; and,
- (4) three under the provisions of State special planning enabling legislation. (8)

Four were created by State governments:

- (1) two under State general planning enabling legislation; and,
- (2) two by special act of State legislatures. (9)

Thus five were created under State special planning enabling legislation, and 16 under State general legislation. Copies of both a State special act and a general planning enabling act are included in the Appendix of this thesis.

There are certain advantages to the use of each type of State legislation. These advantages are discussed below.

State Act Authorizing Intergovernmental Cooperation

The Portland (Oregon) Metropolitan Planning Commission was created under the provisions of a general State act authorizing intergovernmental cooperation.

Municipalities, districts, or commissions situated in any county or counties may . . . enter into written agreements with . . . each other, for the joint performance of any and all similar administrative functions and activities of their local governments . . . the consolidated agency or institution set up is vested with all powers, rights, duties, and functions theretofore existing by law in the separate agencies so consolidated. (10)

The creation of a metropolitan planning agency under such an act has several advantages. The act gives to local governments a "home rule" provision for taking cooperative action to alleviate regional problems. The act authorizes the expansion of intergovernmental cooperative functions. The rate of expansion and the types of functions to be provided are determined by the local governments. The metropolitan planning agency is given more latitude in proposing solutions to area-wide problems, for local governments can move quickly to act upon

agency recommendations. Local governments can join in cooperative endeavors on their own initiative without seeking State enabling legislation for each additional function. Finally, the authority granted local governments in the act overcomes the need to create single-purpose special districts to solve regional problems.

Special Legislation

Five metropolitan planning agencies were created under special State legislation. Of these, three agencies were created under special planning enabling legislation which authorized the establishment of a metropolitan planning agency by the local governments of a specified metropolitan area. The other two agencies were created by special acts of their respective State legislatures (Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission and the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission).

The use of special legislation has two advantages. It can often be enacted when general legislation of state-wide applicability is not politically acceptable to a State legislature. The creation of a metropolitan planning agency under these conditions need not await the passage of general legislation, since "local courtesy" bills applying only to one area can often be readily enacted. A special act may also be used when local governments desire to define by State law their representation or a unique method of financing, rather than having these be a matter of periodic local discussion.

General Legislation

General planning enabling legislation usually authorizes the formation of a metropolitan planning agency by any contiguous group of

local governments. However, one general act authorizes the creation of an agency by the governor (Wisconsin), and one general act authorizes the creation of an agency by the State Plan Commission (Maryland).

The use of general legislation to create a metropolitan planning agency has three advantages. Certain states, including Wisconsin, have constitutional or statutory restrictions prohibiting the use of special legislation. In such states, the use of general legislation is essential. The use of general legislation to create a metropolitan planning agency has one legal advantage. In conflicts arising between the provisions of general and special legislation, the courts usually give precedence to general legislation. Finally, the State can establish uniform standards for the organization and powers of metropolitan planning agencies. At the same time general legislation allows local latitude in the organizational agreement establishing a commission. Therefore the authority and responsibility of local governments are respected yet reconciled with area-wide interests. (11)

Creation of Metropolitan Planning Commissions

Twenty-one of the 22 metropolitan planning commissions studied were created by either local governments or State governments, as shown in Table 1.

By Local Governments

Seventeen metropolitan planning commissions were created by local governments. In each case the authority to establish a planning program and to determine the membership, financing, and rules of procedure of the commission was vested in the local legislative bodies. For example,

Table 1. Creation of Metropolitan Planning Agencies

Agency	Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area	Date Created	Method of Establishment
Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission	Atlanta, Georgia	1960	Local resolutions under special act
Baltimore Regional* Planning Council	Baltimore, Maryland	1956	State Plan Commission action under general act
Capital Region Planning Agency	Hartford, Connecticut	1958	Local resolutions under general act
Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission	Detroit, Michigan	1947	Local resolutions under general act
Inter-County Regional Planning Commission	Denver, Colorado	1955	Local resolutions under general act
Joint Planning Commission Lehigh, Northhampton, Counties	Allentown, Bethlehem, Easton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey	1961	Local resolutions under general act

* Operations of the Baltimore Regional Planning Council have been assumed by the Baltimore Region Metropolitan Planning Commission, which was organized after preparation of this thesis had begun. Therefore the Council, rather than the Commission, is included in this study.

Table 1. Creation of Metropolitan Planning Agencies (Continued)

Agency	Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area	Date Created	Method of Establishment
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission	Washington, D. C.	1927	Local resolutions under special act
Metropolitan Dade County Planning Department	Miami, Florida	1957	Local ordinance under Dade County Charter
Metropolitan Planning Commission (Portland)	Portland, Oregon	1958	Local resolutions under general act author- izing intergovernmental cooperation
National Capital Regional Planning Council	Washington, D. C.	1952	Special act of the United States Congress
Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission	Chicago, Illinois	1957	By special act
Northern Virginia Planning and Economic Development Commission	Washington, D. C.	1948	Local resolutions under general act
Regional Planning Agency of South Central Connecticut	New Haven, Connecticut	1949	Local resolutions under general act

Table 1. Creation of Metropolitan Planning Agencies (Continued)

Agency	Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area	Date Created	Method of Establishment
Regional Planning Commission of Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Bernard Parishes	New Orleans, Louisiana	1963	Local resolutions under special act
Richmond Regional Planning Commission	Richmond, Virginia	1956	Local resolutions under general act
Southeastern Massachusetts Regional Planning District	New Bedford, Mass.	1955	Local resolutions under general act
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission	Milwaukee, Wisconsin	1960	State executive order under general act
Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission	Pittsburgh, Pa.	1962	Local resolutions under general act
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission	Akron, Ohio	1957	Local resolutions under general act
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission	Lansing, Michigan	1956	Local resolutions under general act
Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission	Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota	1957	By special act

the general enabling legislation for the Lansing (Michigan) Tri-County Regional Planning Commission authorized the local governments to:

. . . initiate a regional planning program, define the boundaries . . . specify the number, method of appointment and terms of office of members of the regional planning commission and provide for allocating the cost of financing the work . . . (12)

The advantages of the local governments' creating a metropolitan planning commission are several. Local governments are able to work out organizational and financial arrangements in a manner best meeting local needs. (13) The willingness and financial capabilities of local governments to participate in planning may vary from year to year. Disputes may arise as to financial obligations or services to be received from the commission. These disputes can often be resolved quickly by local resolution. Creation of metropolitan planning agencies by local governments ensures the retention of local determination, power, and responsibility. Local governments are directly accountable to the citizens for the success or failure of the agency. Finally, creation of a metropolitan planning agency by local governments encourages maximum use of the agency. It would not be established were it not beneficial to the local governments, and were they unwilling to support it.

By State Governments

The establishment of a metropolitan planning commission by the State appears to be simply a unique method of creating the commission. It gives the State no actual control over local affairs, since the creation of a metropolitan planning commission occurs only upon petition or request by the local governments. In addition, the State can encourage the creation of a metropolitan planning commission by local

governments even though it has no legal responsibility for the commission's creation. A State agency can, for example, act as a "third party" to local governments creating a metropolitan planning commission. The State agency can recommend a reasonable solution to disputes arising among local governments as to their representation or other organizational problems. (14)

Four metropolitan planning agencies have been created by State governments (see Table 1). The Baltimore Regional Planning Council was created by the Maryland State Plan Commission upon petition of the local governments. The Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission was created by executive order of the Governor of Wisconsin upon petition of the local governments. The Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission and the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission were created by their respective State legislatures. The State legislation which created the Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission reads as follows:

There is created a body politic and corporate by the name and style of Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission to exercise the powers and duties prescribed by this Act for such Commission. (15)

The Acts creating these two agencies were passed at the request of local legislative delegations representing the local governments. The creation of a metropolitan planning commission by the State legislature eliminates one step in the commission's establishment. The State legislature creates the agency directly rather than enabling local legislative bodies to create it by resolution.

Membership of Metropolitan Planning Commissions

Members of metropolitan planning commissions are State officials, local officials or citizens.

State Officials

State administrative officials are members of the Baltimore Regional Planning Council and Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission, as shown in Table 2. These members are selected by the agencies they represent.

A State may desire representation on a metropolitan planning commission for several reasons. It has a vested interest in its metropolitan areas. They are a major tax source and they require a significant expenditure of State funds. Thus their well-being affects the entire State. A State, through its representatives, may be able to balance metropolitan interests with State interests and coordinate the allocation of funds for various State programs.

Local governments desire State representatives for a similar reason. State assistance may be required in solving many problems which affect more than one local government. The Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission considers the membership of State representatives essential. Through these members the Commission is able to coordinate State action with local action in finding solutions to metropolitan problems. (16)

Local Officials

Local officials represent the governments responsible for carrying out metropolitan planning commission recommendations. Their membership may ensure that local action is in accordance with regional

Table 2. Organization of Metropolitan Planning Agencies

Agency	Governments Represented	Size	Composition	CITIZEN MEMBERS	
				Term of Office	Appointed by
Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission	5 Counties 1 City	15	Mayor of Atlanta 5 County Commission Chairmen 9 Citizens	3	Mayor of Atlanta (2) County Commission Chair- men (7)
Baltimore Regional Planning Council	1 State 1 City 5 Counties	13	Elected Head and 1 Other Member Each City and County Legislative Body (12) 1 State Representative		
Capitol Region Planning Agency	2 Cities 25 Towns	56	27 Local Planning Com- missioners 29 Citizens	2	Local Government Elected Heads (29)
Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Plan- ning Commission	1 State 5 Counties 2 Special Districts	75	43 Local Officials* 27 Citizens 5 State Representatives	3	Governor appoints all mem- bers upon recommendation of Commission nominating committee
Inter-County Regional Planning Commission	5 Counties 17 Cities 3 Special Districts	30	5 County Commission Chairmen 25 Citizens	3	County Commission Chairmen (5), Mayors of Cities (17), Special Districts (3)

* Appointed officials

Table 2. Organization of Metropolitan Planning Agencies (Continued)

Agency	Governments Represented	Size	Composition	CITIZEN MEMBERS	
				Term of Office	Appointed by
Joint Planning Com- mission: Lehigh, Northhampton Counties	2 Counties	18	18 Citizens	6	County Commission Chair- men (18)
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission	2 Counties	10	10 Citizens	4	County Board Chairmen (10)
Metropolitan Dade County Planning Department	1 County	11	11 Citizens	3	County Board Chairmen (11)
Metropolitan Plan- ning Commission (Portland)	3 Counties 1 City	4	Mayor of Portland 3 County Commission Chairmen		
National Capital Regional Planning Council	6 Counties 1 Federal	10	Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia; Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission; 4 Officials, 1 each of 4 Northern Virginia Govern- ments; 4 Officials, 2 from each Maryland County		

Table 2. Organization of Metropolitan Planning Agencies (Continued)

Agency	Governments Represented	Size	Composition	CITIZEN MEMBERS	
				Term of Office	Appointed by
Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission	1 State 6 Counties 1 City	19	19 Citizens	4	Mayor of Chicago (5), Governor (8), County Com- mission Chairmen (6)
Northern Virginia Planning and Economic Development Commis- sion	3 Cities 4 Counties	22	7 Elected Head each Government 7 Local Planning Com- missioners 8 Citizens	4	Mayors of Cities (4), County Board Chairmen (4)
Regional Planning Agency of South Central Connecticut	15 Cities	38	19 Citizens 19 Representatives each Local Planning Com- mission	2	Mayors of Cities (19)
Regional Planning Commission of Jef- ferson, Orleans, and St. Bernard Parishes	3 Parishes	6	6 Parish Officials	3	
Richmond Regional Planning Commission	2 Counties 1 City	9	Mayor of Richmond 2 County Commission Chair- men 3 Local Planning Commis- sioners 3 Citizens		County Board Chairmen (3)

Table 2. Organization of Metropolitan Planning Agencies (Continued)

Agency	Governments Represented	Size	Composition	CITIZEN MEMBERS	
				Term of Office	Appointed by
Southeastern Massachusetts Regional Planning District	2 Cities 13 Townships	15	1 Representative each Planning Board		
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission	7 Counties 2 Cities 3 Townships	21	7 County* Officials 14 Citizens	6	County Board Chairmen (7), Governor (7)
Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission	6 Counties	18	6 County Commissioners* 6 County Planning Commissioners 6 Citizens	3	County Board Chairmen (6)
Tri-County Planning Commission (Akron)	3 Counties 25 Cities 7 Special Districts	64	25 Mayors 39 Citizens	4	County Commission Chairmen (39)
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Lansing)	3 Counties	12	9 County Supervisors 3 County Chairmen		
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Peoria)	3 Counties 14 Cities 6 Special Districts	45	6 County Officials 21 Local Officials 18 Citizens	3	County Board Chairmen (18)

* Appointed officials

Table 2. Organization of Metropolitan Planning Agencies (Continued)

Agency	Governments Represented	Size	Composition	CITIZEN MEMBERS	
				Term of Office	Appointed by
Twin Cities Metro- politan Planning Commission	7 Counties 11 Cities 3 Special Districts	30	2 Mayors and 2 Council- men* from each Central City, 7 County Commis- sion Chairmen, 2 Town- ship Officials*, 7 Suburban Representatives, 3 Special District Representatives, 7 Citi- zens	5	County Board Chairmen (7), Special Districts (3), Governor (7)

* Appointed officials

plans. The membership of local officials may also ensure that the needs and desires of local governments are respected in the formulation of regional plans and policy. However, the experience of the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission and other agencies indicates that since local officials have many demands made upon their time, they cannot always attend commission meetings or be effective members. (17)

Nineteen commissions have local officials representing local governments, as shown in Table 2. In most cases these are elected officials who serve by virtue of their office. Normally an official may appoint an alternate representative to serve in his place. In other cases, appointed officials representing local governments are members of metropolitan planning commissions. These appointed officials may be members of local planning commissions or representatives of departments of local government. They are usually appointed by the elected head of each local government.

Basis of Representation. Each participating local government usually has an equal number of local officials on a metropolitan planning commission. For example, four local governments are represented on the Portland (Oregon) Metropolitan Planning Commission (City of Portland and three counties). Each local government is represented by one elected official.

Voting Rights. Ex-officio members of all but one commission have voting rights. The chairman of each of the three county boards of the Lansing (Michigan) Tri-County Regional Planning Commission has no voting right. The nine other ex-officio members of that commission, also representing the county boards, do have voting rights. (18)

Citizen Members

Citizen members may represent influential and important private groups in the metropolitan area--the informal citizen power structure--in addition to the local governments. They are concerned with the economic and social interests affecting the metropolitan area as well as the interests of the local governments they represent. Citizen members are not as involved with local governmental problems and operations as are local officials. They may, therefore, be more receptive to metropolitan solutions to many area-wide governmental problems.

Twenty-two metropolitan planning commissions have citizen members representing local governments. One has citizen members representing private organizations (Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission). The following sections deal with the appointment, basis of representation, terms of office and compensation of citizen members.

Appointment. Responsibility for the appointment of citizen members usually rests with the elected head of each local government. For example, the Mayor of Atlanta and the Chairman of each participating county commission appoint citizen members to the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission. (19) The appointment of citizen members by the heads of local governments ensures that those governments have representatives directly responsible to them.

The Governor appoints citizen members of the Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, and the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission. The appointments are made from a list of nominees submitted to

the Governor by the elected head of each local government. (20)

The Governor of Michigan appoints all members to the Detroit Region Metropolitan Area Planning Commission. His appointments are made from a list of nominees submitted to him by the Commission's nominating committee. That committee makes its recommendations from nominations given to it by each local government and private organization represented on the Commission. According to the agency's rules of procedure,

Twenty-seven members of the Commission shall be representative of broad civic, economic, and social fields, selected by the Nominating Committee of the Commission from recommendations of appropriate organizations and groups, as follows:

Banking and Finance.1 representative
Building Industry.1 representative
Church Bodies (One each from Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish)3 representatives
Engineering.1 representative
Health and Social Welfare.1 representative
Labor.4 representatives
League of Women Voters1 representative
Manufacturing.4 representatives
Merchandising.1 representative
Public Relations1 representative
Public Utilities4 representatives
Racial, Ethnic, and Cultural Groups3 representatives
Real Estate Appraisers1 representative
Research Agencies.1 representative (21)

Stanley Scott, Professor of Political Science at the University of California, suggests that gubernatorial appointments may be appropriate:

- (1) when the metropolitan area crosses state boundaries;
- (2) when one metropolitan area contains a large portion
of the state's population (Boston). (22)

Such appointments remove the responsibility for commission opera-

tions from the local governments. Gubernatorial appointment may be " . . . neither nonrepresentative nor misrepresentative, but it is not metropolitan self-government." (23) It is doubtful that a State governor is able--due to his other responsibilities--to give as much consideration to the appointment of citizen members as are local government officials.

Basis of Representation. On eight commissions the local governments of the more populous cities and counties appoint more citizen members than do the governments of the less populous cities and counties. For example, citizen membership on the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission is as follows. The City of Atlanta and the two most populous counties each appoints two citizen members. One citizen member is appointed by the government of each of the three less populous counties.

It is reasonable to give the governments of the more populous cities and counties greater representation since they have greater political power and financial resources. On the other hand, the experience of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission indicates that giving greater representation to the governments of the more populous cities and counties can result in central city-suburban conflicts. (24)

Terms of Office. The terms of office of citizen members, as shown in Table 2, vary from one to six years. Citizen members usually serve three to four year overlapping terms. The use of overlapping terms prevents the entire commission from leaving office at one time.

The term of office is a matter for local determination, although it appears that a three or four year term is advisable. Such a term allows members sufficient time to become familiar with the planning

program and requirements of the metropolitan area. However, the opportunity to remove disinterested or ineffectual members is enhanced by a short term of office.

Compensation. The citizen members of all but one commission serve without pay, although they are reimbursed for expenses incurred in fulfilling their commission responsibilities. The ten members of the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission each receive \$3600 annually, since they have certain administrative duties. However, in a recent organizational study of the agency, the elimination of their administrative duties and of their salaries was recommended. (25)

Compensation of commission members appears to be an unnecessary practice, since " . . . men of high caliber are usually willing to render public service without pay." (26) The time required of commission members does not place an undue burden upon them. Further, there is no evidence that only "men of means" can afford to serve the commission.

Meetings of Metropolitan Planning Commissions

As shown in Table 2, thirteen commissions hold regular monthly meetings, eight meet quarterly, and two meet every two weeks. All meetings are open to the public.

It appears that monthly meetings of the commission (or its executive committee) are a necessity. Regional matters require Commission attention on a regular monthly basis. An active, imaginative staff requires monthly meetings so that the continuing planning program, under the policy direction of the commission, can be effective.

All commissions designate one of their regular meetings as the official annual meeting. At this meeting officers are elected and the budget adopted. Two commissions (the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission and the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission) hold public hearings on the budget and adopt the budget at the annual meeting.

A majority of the membership constitutes a quorum for all but two commissions. One-third of the membership constitutes a quorum for the Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission. Two-thirds of the membership of the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission constitutes a quorum for the annual meeting and for any other meeting at which funds are to be appropriated. For other regular meetings, a majority of the membership constitutes a quorum. (27)

All commissions have provisions for calling special meetings. The chairman, executive committee, or a specified number of members may call special meetings. Advance notice must be given all members. Only that business for which the meeting is called may be discussed.

Metropolitan Planning Commission Committees

Several of the commissions use committees to aid in carrying out their responsibilities. These committees include:

- (1) internal committees;
- (2) citizen advisory committees; and,
- (3) technical advisory committees.

Members of these committees are normally appointed by the chairman of the Commission.

Internal Committees

Internal committees are those composed of commission members. Two types of internal committees may be established, special and executive.

Special. The special committees are ad hoc committees established periodically. The function of each is to report to the commission on a special project or problem. Each is dissolved when its report is submitted. For example, the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission established a special committee to prepare a report for submittal to the State Legislature. The report requested an increase in the Commission's tax levy. Upon completion of the report, the committee was dissolved. (28) Another example of a special ad hoc committee is the nominating committee established annually by most commissions to nominate officers.

Executive. Executive committees are used by five metropolitan planning commissions. They meet monthly and may hold special meetings upon call of the chairman.

The executive committees are normally responsible for the " . . . broad policy and management of the business of the Commission between regular meetings." (29) The executive committees of the Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission, the Inter-County (Denver) Regional Planning Council, and the Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission advise the commission on agency policy and programs. Their recommendations are subject to approval of the commission at its next regular meeting. The executive committees of the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission and the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission act for the membership of the Commission

in all matters but approval of the general plan and annual report and adoption of the budget. These actions are taken by the Commission as a whole. (30)

The use of an executive committee is dependent upon local requirements and the organizational arrangements used by each metropolitan planning commission. However, the use of executive committees is essential for those commissions meeting quarterly.

Citizen Advisory Committees

Two commissions use citizen advisory committees to " . . . achieve a broad base of community support for planning and to translate commission objectives and policies to the public." (31) The citizen advisory committee of the Inter-County Regional Planning Commission (Denver) is composed of 50 members representing business, cultural, and social organizations. The citizen advisory committee of the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Lansing, Michigan) is composed of 500 citizens. Selected members of the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission citizen advisory committee serve on various advisory boards. Each advisory board is responsible for building support for specific Commission planning projects. In 1962 three boards were used by the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission--water advisory board, street naming and parcel numbering advisory board, and land use mapping advisory board. (32)

Each of the two commissions considers the use of a citizen advisory committee an essential part of its program. The Director of the Inter-County Regional Planning Commission (Denver) stated that its citizens advisory committee was responsible for assuring cooperation in metropolitan planning. In 1957 one of the five local governments with-

drew from the Commission. One other local government threatened to withhold its financial support. The leaders of the citizen advisory committee contacted these local governments and urged their continued cooperation in planning. They stated that such cooperation was essential to continued economic growth in the Denver region. This action by the leadership of the committee led the first local government to rejoin the Commission, and the other to continue its financial support. (33)

Most metropolitan planning commissions rely on their public information programs to achieve community support. It appears, however, that an active citizen advisory committee composed of civic leaders can be effective in strengthening and sustaining metropolitan planning efforts.

Technical Advisory Committees

Four commissions use technical advisory committees (see Table 3). The members of these committees represent public and private agencies dealing with regional problems such as water supply, flood control, and natural resources. The members are individuals whose specialized knowledge of these regional problems makes their advice and interest valuable to the Commission.

The advantages of using such committees are several. The advice of specialists on matters of technical complexity can be secured. The members can bring to the attention of the Commission the need for particular studies. Finally, effective liason with local governments in carrying out regional proposals can be achieved through technical advisory committees. For example, the technical advisory committee on flood control of the Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning

Commission is composed of local government public works officials. These members have been important in coordinating action on Commission flood control proposals among the Chicago-area local governments. (34)

Metropolitan planning agencies are usually created by local governments under the provisions of State general planning enabling legislation. Most commissions are composed of elected officials and citizen members representing each local government. Members usually are appointed by elected heads of local governments, and serve three or four year terms without compensation. Metropolitan planning commissions meet on a regular monthly or quarterly basis. Only two use citizens advisory committees and four use technical advisory committees.

Table 3. Metropolitan Planning Agency Technical Advisory Committees

Agency	Water—		Natural Resources	Transpor- tation	Public Facilities	Popu- lation Housing
	Flood Control	Sewer- age				
Detroit Metro- politan Area Regional Planning Commission	x	x	x		x	x
Northeastern Illi- nois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission	x	x				
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Lansing, Mich.)	x	x	x	x	x	
Southeastern Wis- consin Regional Planning Commis- sion			x	x		

CHAPTER III

FINANCING OF METROPOLITAN PLANNING AGENCIES

This chapter is an analysis of the financial arrangements employed by metropolitan planning agencies, including their:

- (1) sources of revenue; and,
- (2) expenditure of funds.

Sources of Revenue

Metropolitan planning agencies may receive their revenue from (as shown in Table 4):

- (1) a special metropolitan planning tax;
- (2) local governments;
- (3) State governments;
- (4) the Federal government;
- (5) private contributions;
- (6) payments for technical assistance; and,
- (7) other sources.

Special Metropolitan Planning Tax

Four agencies receive financial support from a special metropolitan planning tax. The Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Southeastern Massachusetts Regional Planning District, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, and the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission are authorized by State legislation to order the local governments to assess, collect, and pay to the Commission

Table 4. Metropolitan Planning Agency Sources of Revenue--1962

(In Thousands of Dollars)

Agency	Total	Tax	Local Governments		State	Federal	Private	Payment for Technical	Other
			Cities	Counties				Asst.	
Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission	253.6		36.7	100.2		42.5		50.5	24.7
Baltimore Regional Planning Council	45.0		5.0	10.0	5.0	25.0			
Capital Region Planning Agency (Hartford)	71.2		21.5		9.2	15.0			25.6
Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission	118.8			80.7		22.1			16.0
Inter-County Regional Planning Commission	102.0			47.5		51.8			2.7
Joint Planning Commis- sion: Lehigh, North- hampton Counties	98.2		38.2	60.0					
Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission	1459.0	1020.0						89.0	350.0
Metropolitan Dade County Planning Department	253.0			201.0		52.0			

Table 4. Metropolitan Planning Agency Sources of Revenue--1962 (Continued)

(In Thousands of Dollars)

Agency	Total	Tax	Local Governments		State	Federal	Private	Payment for Technical	Other
			Cities	Counties				Asst.	
Metropolitan Planning Commission (Portland)	55.7		14.9	14.4		23.8			2.5
National Capital Regional Planning Council	116.5		2.8	2.7		111.0			
Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission	350.2		51.4	68.0	60.6	135.9	30.7		3.7
Northern Virginia Plan- ning and Economic Development Commission	95.8		7.6	32.2	4.7	50.0			1.3
Regional Planning Agency of South Central Connecticut	42.6		18.3		9.0	15.3			
Regional Planning Commis- sion of Jefferson, Orleans(1963) and St. Bernard Parishes	108.0			18.0	18.0	72.0			
Richmond Regional Planning Commission	51.6		8.1	7.0	5.0	27.0			4.5

Table 4. Metropolitan Planning Agency Sources of Revenue--1962 (Continued)

(In Thousands of Dollars)

Agency	Total	Tax	Local Governments		State	Federal	Private	Payment for Technical	Other
			Cities	Counties				Asst.	
Southeastern Massachu- setts Regional Planning District	31.5	11.5				20.0			
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission	142.3	75.0				37.7			29.6
Southwestern Pennsyl- vania Regional Planning Commission	43.5			19.1			24.6		
Tri-County Planning Commission (Akron)	155.0		10.0	65.0		25.0		55.0	
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Lansing)	94.2		1.5	46.0		46.5			
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Peoria)	59.1			56.4					2.7
Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission	215.8	118.0				97.9			

a special metropolitan planning tax. The levy of the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission is mandatory at \$.03 per \$100 of assessed valuation, but may be increased to an additional amount approved by the two participating governments. (35) The tax levy of the other three agencies is permissive. Each agency annually establishes a tax rate which will produce the amount of tax funds required to finance its programs. However, a maximum rate is established by State law. The tax rate in the Southeastern Massachusetts and Twin Cities areas cannot exceed .10 of a mill per dollar of metropolitan area assessed valuation. The rate in the Southeastern Wisconsin area cannot exceed .03 of a mill per dollar of metropolitan area assessed valuation. (36)

Financing the work of a metropolitan planning commission through a special tax levy may ensure a continuing annual revenue source to a greater degree than voluntary payments from local governments. However, use of a special tax to finance commission programs appears to be unwise policy for four reasons. The levying of a tax by an independent agency increases the financial fragmentation of local governments. Secondly, citizens often resent the addition of a special tax. Thirdly, as expressed by the Executive Director of the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission, support for metropolitan planning should be voluntary. Payments should be made for benefits received, rather than required by law. (37) Finally, special tax revenues are often inflexible since a maximum levy is usually established. Three of the four agencies receiving such revenue are levying a tax at the maximum rate established by State law, and claim that it does not produce sufficient funds. Adjustments can occur only by amending the State enabling

legislation. (38)

Local Governments

Seventeen commissions receive financial support from local governments. These payments are voluntary, and are appropriated from general tax revenues. There is no limit to the amount which may be paid, except as determined by the local governments.

The amount paid to the Commission by each local government is based upon the per cent of total metropolitan area population residing in each jurisdiction (per capita payment). For example, the Director of the Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission prepares annually a proposed budget and determines the amount to be paid by each participating local government. The payment of each government is based upon population: i.e., Wayne County, representing 62 per cent of the metropolitan area population, contributes 62 per cent of the locally financed budget. (39)

Basing local payments upon population most closely balances payments received with services rendered to local governments. Population is the best single indicator of services provided to local governments by a metropolitan planning agency in carrying out a regional planning program and in providing local planning assistance.

The amount paid by each local government to the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission is defined by its enabling legislation (\$.12 per capita payment from each local government). (40) Defining local government payments based upon population in enabling legislation has several advantages. Payments are not the result of extensive annual negotiations between the Commission and local governments. The local

governments know the extent of their annual financial obligations to the Commission. Payments based upon population are a part of the law and payments according to its provisions are required of those who join the Commission. This gives the Commission the financial continuity necessary without the mandatory measures required under special taxation powers. The Commission is able to estimate its income each year and adjust its programs accordingly. Finally, flexibility is provided, since as population growth occurs more funds are received.

There are two additional advantages to the financial arrangements of the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission. The Commission is responsible for the annual estimates of population within each jurisdiction, upon which local government payments are based. There is built into the financial arrangements a means for the Commission to keep current population data available, and to make long range estimates of population. The second advantage is political. The local governments are proud of the annual population estimates which reveal the extent of their growth. As the leader of a small Georgia county said:

With new industries moving into the area we wanted to be included on the metropolitan maps. We couldn't see any better way to take advantage of the region's momentum than to get on the metropolitan planning bandwagon. (41)

The disadvantage of per capita financing is that some governments with little population will contribute less than the actual costs incurred by the planning commission in serving them. However, The Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission overcame this disadvantage by making a \$2,000 base fee payment by each local government a part of its financial arrangements. A base fee payment ensures that each local

government pays a minimum share for the benefits received from a commission. However, base fee payments should be used only to supplement other financing methods, since not all governments require the same or equal services from a metropolitan planning agency. A government with a larger population has greater financial resources, requires more planning services and will probably receive greater benefits from an agency.

State Governments

Five states make financial contributions to metropolitan planning agencies (see Table 4). The funds are allocated by direct legislative appropriation or, in one case, from discretionary funds of the Governor (Northern Virginia Planning and Economic Development Commission).

Only one State makes a significant contribution. In 1962 the Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission received \$100,000, about one-third of its budget, from the State of Illinois. State contributions received by the other four agencies constitute only a small percentage of their total revenue.

There are several reasons for State financial participation in metropolitan planning. A metropolitan area contributes greatly to State tax revenues and its efficient development is important to the economic well-being of the State. States make significant investments in metropolitan areas through highway construction, welfare payments, and other services. States may ensure the wise use of such funds by participating in the planning of major facilities and programs which they will later finance. Certain States make contributions to multi-jurisdictional planning agencies because the financial resources of the

local governments vary. This is done to overcome the problems of local financing and to stimulate local governments to act cooperatively in meeting mutual area-wide governmental problems. (42)

For two reasons State participation is limited. In rurally dominated State legislatures it is politically difficult to secure State assistance. Secondly, since the State has many demands on its resources other requirements take precedence over financial aid to planning.

State governments should give financial aid to metropolitan planning agencies. However, such aid should assure continuing financial support. The agency should be given the freedom to determine the purpose for which funds will be expended. For example, beginning January 1, 1965, the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission will receive \$40,000 annually from the State of Georgia. The funds are granted by the State to encourage the establishment and support the programs of regional planning agencies.

Federal Government

With one exception the Federal funds used by metropolitan planning agencies are those granted under Section 701 of the Federal Housing Act of 1954, as amended (Urban Planning Assistance Program). Federal funds received by the National Capital Regional Planning Council are from direct congressional appropriations. (43)

Under the provisions of Section 701, the Federal government pays up to two-thirds of the cost of specified urban planning activities. These grants are made to official planning agencies for the preparation of studies and plans which are a part of a comprehensive planning program. Section 701 defines comprehensive planning as:

- (1) the preparation of general plans for land use and public facilities, including transportation plans;
- (2) capital improvements programming;
- (3) coordination of all planning programs of participating governments; and,
- (4) preparation of regulatory and administrative measures related to the above activities. (44)

In general, metropolitan planning agencies may receive 701 grants for any planning studies with the exclusion of:

- (1) plans for public works;
- (2) "city plans"--plans primarily concerned with only one local government, rather than the metropolitan area; and,
- (3) plans for areas in which urban development is not a major factor. (45)

The Federal government also requires that all decision making bodies affected by a study must participate in its preparation. For example, a State highway department must participate in a transportation study if an agency is to receive 701 aid. This Federal policy requirement was expressed in a speech by the Commissioner for Urban Planning and Development (Housing and Home Finance Agency).

In embarking on regional planning, the Association of Bay Area Governments must recognize that the Association does not include all of the key decision-makers. The missing chairs at ABAG must be filled or participation satisfied by other means. No less important, in my view, is the need for participation by the State Highway Department. In the Bay Area, you should aim at a single regional planning study, jointly financed and directed by the ABAG and the State Department of Public Works, and with the participation of major regional development agencies such as the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit Authority. These conditions

are basic to the success of a regional planning program; they are, by the same token, basic to financial participation by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. (46)

With all the decision making bodies represented, the likelihood of plan implementation is certainly enhanced.

Fifteen of the 22 agencies studied use 701 funds in their planning programs. Of the agencies not using the funds (other than the National Capital Regional Planning Council), two are relatively new and have not as yet developed the program needed to apply for funds. The other four have adequate financial resources or are engaged in plan implementation programs, for which 701 funds are not readily available.

Federal (701) funds constitute from 20 to 50 per cent of the total budget of most agencies. The funds used in 1962 varied from a low of \$15,000 (21 per cent of total budget) by the Capital Region Planning Agency (Hartford) to a high of \$135,900 (38 per cent of total budget) by the Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission.

Federal financial aid has expanded the programs of the agencies and has stimulated the preparation of special studies that might not have been prepared if only local funds had been available. It appears, however, that metropolitan planning programs would exist without Federal aid.

Federal financial aid for planning programs may be broadened. Roscoe Martin, Professor of Political Science at Syracuse, points out a trend toward allocating 701 funds "for continuing comprehensive planning" programs rather than on the basis of individual projects. (47) The need for this comprehensive approach to allocating 701 funds was expressed by the American Municipal Association in a resolution adopted in September,

1962.

Effective comprehensive planning in metropolitan areas is necessary to help achieve a sound and orderly pattern of metropolitan development . . . we recommend that section 701 of the Housing Act be amended to provide continuing support grants for comprehensive planning activities to metropolitan planning agencies rather than solely on the basis of individual projects. (48)

In summary, broadened Federal financial aid for planning--granted for continuing and comprehensive planning programs--will be a major factor in expanding metropolitan planning programs.

Private Contributions

Major contributions from private sources are received by two metropolitan planning commissions. The Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission received funds from " . . . charitable and private organizations." (49) The Ford Foundation and Regional Plan Association of Pittsburgh granted funds to the Southwestern Pennsylvania Region Planning Commission. (50) Normally these funds may be used for any purpose the Commission determines. However, the grant by the Ford Foundation was for a special study.

Revenue from private organizations has aided metropolitan planning agencies, particularly in their formative stages. It constitutes, if not a significant source of revenue, at least a not inconsequential one. (51) Although contributions from private organizations are not generally a continuing revenue source, they are desirable as evidence of the interest of private organizations in metropolitan planning. The willingness of private groups to partially finance certain studies indicates how interested they are in using study results. For example, a central business district study is often made only if the business groups affected

by the study help finance its preparation. Their investment makes it more likely that they will carry out the recommendations of the study.

Payments for Technical Assistance

In 1962 three agencies received significant payments for technical assistance provided to local governments. The Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission and the Tri-County Planning Commission (Akron) received payments for the preparation of planning studies for certain local governments in the metropolitan area. The largest payment received by the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission for technical assistance was from Fulton County (\$20,000). Fulton County contracts annually with the Commission for technical assistance. (52) The Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission is paid to review subdivision plats for its two participating counties.

Other Sources

Eleven agencies list "other" sources of revenue. In general, this is not revenue but a balance carried over from the previous year. For example, the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission carried over a balance of \$20,000. An exception was the Maryland National Park and Planning Commission which in 1962 issued certificates of indebtedness--a long term loan--in the amount of \$350,000.

Expenditure of Funds

Total expenditures of metropolitan planning agencies range from \$839,000 (Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission) to \$13,000 (Southeastern Massachusetts Regional Planning District).

Table 5 shows expenditures for office rent, equipment, and sup-

plies, and for personal services (staff salaries and consultants fees). Metropolitan planning agencies use staff rather than consultant services in most cases, and staff salaries constitute their major expenditure. However, those for consultant services are significant in several cases. Consultants are used primarily by agencies having substantial financial resources.

Table 6 shows estimated program expenditures for regional planning and local planning assistance. Administrative expenditures (executive salaries, office rent, equipment and supplies) were estimated for each program in the same proportion as those for personal services. This was done because the available information on expenditures did not indicate the administrative costs of the programs. However, it is common practice to assign administrative costs to programs or studies based on the cost of personal services.

Table 5. Metropolitan Planning Agency Personal Expenditures

1962

(In Thousands of Dollars)

Agency	Total	Per Capita	Office Rent, Equipment, and Supplies	Personal Services	
				Staff Salaries	Consultants Fees
Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission	253.6	\$.22	81.1	161.5	11.0
Baltimore Regional Planning Council	45.0	.03	4.0	34.0	7.0
Capital Region Planning Agency (Hartford)	46.2	.09	11.0	33.2	1.0

Table 5. Metropolitan Planning Agency Personal Expenditures

1962 (Continued)

(In Thousands of Dollars)

Agency	Total	Per Capita	Office Rent, Equipment, and Supplies	Personal Services	
				Staff Salaries	Consultants Fees
Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Plan- ning Commission	126.1	.03	13.9	103.1	9.1
Inter-County Regional Planning Commission	108.4	.11	16.8	80.6	11.0
Joint Planning Commis- sion: Lehigh, North- hampton Counties	98.2	.20	42.2	56.0	0
Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission	839.7	.07	211.3	562.4	66.0
Metropolitan Dade County Planning Department	230.2	.25	41.4	143.6	45.2
Metropolitan Planning Commission (Portland)	55.7	.08	13.8	41.9	0
National Capital Regional Planning Council	116.5	.06	2.0	96.5	18.0
Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission	316.5	.05	95.7	203.4	17.4
Northern Virginia Planning and Economic Development Commis- sion	66.3	.02	8.8	57.5	0
Regional Planning Agency of South Central Connecticut	42.6	.10	8.1	33.2	1.3

Table 5. Metropolitan Planning Agency Personal Expenditures

1962 (Continued)

(In Thousands of Dollars)

Agency	Total	Per Capita	Office Rent,	Personal Services		
			Equipment, and Supplies	Staff Salaries	Consultants Fees	
Regional Planning Commission of Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Bernard Parishes			Not Available (Began Program Late 1963)			
Richmond Regional Planning Commission	51.6	.13	6.6	18.5	26.5	
Southeastern Massachusetts Regional Planning District	13.0	.03	1.1	1.9	10.0	
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission	117.3	.08	31.1	69.2	17.0	
Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission	43.5	.02	8.3	24.8	10.4	
Tri-County Planning Commission (Akron)	155.0	.23	20.0	135.0	0	
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Lansing)	94.2	.33	17.2	61.0	16.0	
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Peoria)	36.6	.12	7.9	18.9	0	
Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission	205.8	.13	41.2	164.6	0	

Table 6. Estimated Metropolitan Planning Agency Program Expenditures

1962

(In Thousands of Dollars)

Agency	Total	Regional Planning		Local Planning	
		Dollars of Total	Per Cent	Dollars of Total	Per Cent
Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission	254	211	84	43	16
Baltimore Regional Planning Council	45	45	100		
Capital Region Planning Agency (Hartford)	46	46	100		
Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission	126	94	75	32	25
Inter-County Regional Planning Commission	108	88	82	20	18
Joint Planning Commission: Lehigh, Northhampton Counties	98	98	100		
Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission	840	482	58	358	42
Metropolitan Dade County Planning Department	230	208	91	22	9
Metropolitan Planning Commission (Portland)	56	56	100		
National Capital Regional Planning Council	117	117	100		
Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission	316	282	90	34	10
Northern Virginia Planning and Economic Development Commission	66	66	100		
Regional Planning Agency of South Central Connecticut	43	43	100		

Table 6. Estimated Metropolitan Planning Agency Program Expenditures
1962 (Continued)
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Agency	Total	Regional Planning		Local Planning	
		Per Cent		Per Cent	
		Dollars of Total		Dollars of Total	
Regional Planning Commission of Jefferson, Orleans and St. Bernard Parishes	Not Available (Began Program Late 1963)				
Richmond Regional Planning Commission	52	52	100		
Southeastern Massachusetts Regional Planning District	13	13	100		
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission	117	98	84	19	16
Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission	44	44	100		
Tri-County Planning Commis- sion (Akron)	155	125	81	30	19
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Lansing)	94	94	100		
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Peoria)	37	37	100		
Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission	206	174	85	32	15

The expenditures shown are the most current and accurate information available. However, financial records are not always comparable. More complete record systems and better budgetary methods used by some agencies show more accurately their expenditures.

Expenditures for regional planning constitute from 58 to 100 per

cent of each agency's budget. Those for local planning assistance range from 0 to 42 per cent. It appears that the agencies are spending a reasonable amount on their regional planning responsibilities.

Metropolitan planning agencies are supported primarily by payments from local governments, although four receive their primary support from a special tax. State and private contributions are not usually significant sources of revenue. Federal aid is a major revenue source. It has expanded agency programs, and has allowed the preparation of specialized project studies. A modification in the Federal Aid program to planning may result in continuing support for metropolitan planning, rather than aid on a project basis. Agencies allocate their funds primarily for regional planning and rely on staff personnel rather than consultants to fulfill their technical planning responsibilities.

CHAPTER IV

METROPOLITAN PLANNING AGENCY PROGRAMS

The programs of metropolitan planning agencies are those activities through which they fulfill their responsibilities to guide and coordinate economic and physical development within the metropolitan area. They include:

- (1) regional planning; and,
- (2) local planning assistance.

Regional Planning

Metropolitan planning commissions are advisory bodies and must rely upon other governments and agencies to carry out their recommendations. Their enabling legislation instructs them to prepare regional plans and to work with local and other governments to effectuate these plans. They have the authority to " . . . publicize, advertise, and advise all governmental units on the findings, purposes, and objectives . . ." of the regional planning program. (53) A commission's regional planning role is well-summarized in the statement of a former chairman of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission:

. . . the Commission has little authority. Its plans and suggestions are not mandatory. Its role, briefly, is to be a friendly collaborator with a multitude of diverse governments and private interests. (54)

Most regional planning programs include:

- (1) preparation of regional plans;

- (2) review of local and State plans;
- (3) assistance to cooperating agencies; and,
- (4) public information programs.

Preparation of Regional Plans

All 22 metropolitan planning agencies are authorized to prepare and adopt regional comprehensive plans. Fifteen agencies are required by law to prepare regional comprehensive plans (see Table 7). Of these agencies, 11 are required to adopt the plans. All agencies are required to hold public hearings on a plan preceding its adoption.

Adopting regional plans appears to be unimportant and unnecessary. Adopting a plan does not make it legally binding on the commission or local governments. Further, the Housing and Home Finance Agency survey of metropolitan planning agencies reported that " . . . there is no indication that those agencies that have specific statutory authorization to adopt a comprehensive plan have more active technical programs underway . . ." than those lacking such authorization. (55)

Purpose of Regional Plans. Charles M. Harr, Professor of Law at Harvard University, writes that regional plans have two purposes. One, they shape those public activities of a regional nature. Two, the plans serve as a framework for local master plans. Through the preparation of regional plans, local legislative action and administrative decisions regarding land use controls are influenced. (56) Metropolitan planning agencies prepare regional plans " . . . for the guidance of the physical and economic development of the region . . ." (57) It is a responsibility of metropolitan planning agencies to prepare plans not of a local nature and to resolve any conflicts with local plans. They

Table 7. Metropolitan Planning Agencies Required to
Prepare Regional Plans

Agency	Preparation Required	Adoption Required
Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission	Yes	Yes
Baltimore Regional Planning Council	Yes	No
Capital Region Planning Agency	Yes	Yes
Inter-County Regional Planning Commission (Denver)	Yes	Yes
Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission	Yes	Yes
Metropolitan Dade County Department of Planning	Yes	Yes
National Capital Regional Planning Council	Yes	Yes
Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission	Yes	Yes
Northern Virginia Planning and Economic Development Commission	Yes	Yes
Richmond Regional Planning Commission	Yes	Yes
Southeastern Massachusetts Regional Planning District	Yes	Yes
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission	Yes	Yes
Tri-County Planning Commission (Akron)	Yes	No
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Peoria)	Yes	No
Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission	Yes	No

have been given a broad grant of authority to identify and present solutions to existing area-wide problems. In addition, they can recommend action programs to prevent future regional problems. They have suffi-

cient authority to recommend solutions to most of the governmental and developmental problems observed in metropolitan areas. The effectiveness of their recommendations is determined by action taken by local governments and other agencies having regional responsibilities.

Regional Plans Prepared. A survey of metropolitan planning agencies was conducted recently by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. (58) It revealed that except for those agencies most recently organized, all have completed general analysis studies of the population and economy and have carried out land use studies. The survey also revealed that agencies concentrated on the preparation of transportation, health and water supply studies. Community facilities and program type studies were being prepared by only four agencies. The Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission and the Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission have prepared regional capital improvements programs. They are used to guide local governments in formulating their capital improvements programs.

Eleven agencies have completed regional comprehensive plans, including regional transportation plans. These plans generally are:

- (1) statements of regional goals and objectives; or
- (2) plans for development which identify and present solutions to area-wide problems. (59)

All of the plans present statements of regional goals and objectives. They are valuable since an important function of a regional plan is to present data on the region and define regional goals and objectives. Gathering and presenting information can serve as the basis for public and private decision making.

However, to be fully effective regional plans must identify governmental and other problems of regional significance. They must recommend action programs to alleviate these problems. Many agencies have and are preparing such plans. For example, the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission prepared four major reports on the necessity and feasibility of rapid transit in the Atlanta area. These reports resulted in the creation of the Metropolitan Atlanta Transit Study Commission. Working in cooperation with the Planning Commission, the Study Commission developed a plan for rapid transit which included a proposed action program for its implementation. Based upon the plan, local governments are presently carrying out preliminary action necessary to construct the system. (60) A recently published plan for nature preserves provides another example of the Commission's work. It identifies the need for that type of open space, and recommends to local governments a long range financial program to implement the plan proposals. (61) Other agencies are developing regional plans which present concrete and realistic solutions to regional problems. The Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission has developed a plan recommending the creation of a special district to alleviate regional sewerage problems. (62) Open space plans of the Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission resulted in a formal agreement by five counties to acquire land for forest preserves and parks. Urban Renewal Commissioner William Slayton called the agreement a "milestone in coordination between public agencies to achieve a common goal" (63) In addition, the Commission has prepared a flood control plan, and is preparing a plan for water supply. It will propose a "strategy for

intergovernmental cooperation" to satisfy future metropolitan area water needs. (64) Although these regional plans are based upon policy decisions, they make specific recommendations for action to be taken by each local government and State agency. Mr. Paul Opperman, former director of the Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission writes that:

Are policies sufficient, then, as a planning contribution by a metropolitan planning agency? Here, I would say no. For what is missing and what the comprehensive metropolitan plan will provide, is order--the placing of first things first and second things second, in time, in space and in cost--and relationship--the relating of needs and solutions so that (for example) proposed action on transportation supports, rather than frustrates, proposed action on open space preservation, and so that actions by one government support, rather than obstruct, actions of the neighboring government. (65)

Comprehensive regional plans are an instrument to guide local and State governments and to coordinate their actions.

Review of Plans

Thirteen metropolitan planning agencies are authorized to review plans prepared by local and State governments, as shown in Table 8.

Ten metropolitan planning agencies review plans prepared by local governments. The review is usually made only if the local plan affects development or policy beyond the jurisdiction of the local government, as determined by the commission. However, participating governments of three agencies are required by law to submit their plans for review (Inter-County Regional Planning Commission, Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the Regional Planning Agency of South Central Connecticut). Three agencies (Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission, Baltimore Regional Planning Council, and

Table 8. Metropolitan Planning Agencies Authorized to Review Plans

Agency	Authority to Review Other Agencies Plans	
	Local	State
Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission	Yes	No
Baltimore Regional Planning Council	Yes	No
Detroit Region Metropolitan Area Planning Commission	Yes	Yes
Inter-County Regional Planning Commission (Denver)(1)	Yes	No
Joint Planning Commission: Lehigh, Northampton Counties	Yes	No
Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission (1)	Yes	No
Metropolitan Dade County Department of Planning	Yes	No
National Capital Regional Planning Council	Yes	No
Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission	No	Yes
Regional Planning Agency of South Central Connecticut (1)	Yes	No
Regional Planning Commission of Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Bernard Parishes	Yes	No
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Lansing)	No	Yes
Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission	No	Yes

(1) Review of local plans mandatory.

the Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission) review certain local plans financially aided by the Housing and Home Finance

Agency. These three agencies review all applications for Federal aid for open space acquisition made by local governments within their planning region. The review is made upon request of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, to make certain that local open space plans are in accordance with regional open space plans. In addition, the Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission reviews applications for accelerated public works projects and urban renewal plans prepared by local governments in the Detroit region.

Four metropolitan planning agencies review plans prepared by State agencies. The Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, for example, reviews State plans affecting the Chicago area, including highway plans.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations strongly advocates a review of local and State plans by metropolitan planning agencies. The Commission states that

. . . the respective facets of metropolitan area planning must be closely geared into the practical decision making process regarding land use and tax levies . . . (66)

The Commission has recommended the enactment of Federal legislation (passed by the Senate and now under House consideration) which provides that after June 30, 1965, all applications for certain Federal grants and loans within any metropolitan area would have to be accompanied by the review--but not approval--of an official State, metropolitan or regional planning agency. The grants and loans covered by the legislation are those for urban renewal, construction of public works facilities including highways, and public housing. The review would relate to the conformance of the application proposals with comprehensive

regional plans. The review of plans results in an exchange of information between the metropolitan planning agency and other governmental agencies. To some authorities, this is its primary value.

As a matter of established practice if not of legal requirement, all major proposals of a metropolitan planning office should be submitted for review to the state agency and vice versa for state plans affecting a metropolitan area. (67)

The review of plans may result in planning agencies getting beyond

. . . pious platitudes, generalized projections and academic proposals, into the substance of concrete problems and effective working relationships with the operating agencies. (68)

Eight agencies reviewing local plans give only advisory opinions. Although an agency may report that a local plan will have a harmful effect upon regional development, the local government may proceed with its implementation. However, if the Inter-County Regional Planning Commission (Denver) or the Baltimore Regional Planning Council rejects a local plan, its implementation can proceed only if the decision of the regional agency is over-ruled by a two-thirds vote of the local legislative body.

Requiring a local legislative body to over-rule by a two-thirds vote the decision of a regional agency may have some justification.

According to one authority:

. . . we think the time has come when a unit of local government might appropriately be required to take formal action indicating an acceptance or rejection of the agencies recommendation . . . (if formal action were required) it would be possible to determine with some greater certainty than now the trend of public policy with respect to future development in a given urban area. (69)

However, granting a metropolitan planning agency legal controls over local plans appears to be unwise policy. Courts and Federal and State

governments are the only agencies having the authority to force local governments to accept metropolitan planning agency decisions. However, such enforcement of an agency decision would be impractical in its administration, and politically unacceptable. Granting legal controls to an advisory body may discourage cooperation in metropolitan development. The success of metropolitan planning can best be measured not in terms of legal controls to effectuate the plans, but by the effectiveness of leadership and strong working relationships with implementing agencies. Final decisions regarding regional policy must be made at the local level where land use controls can be used effectively. If regional plans are well-developed, local governments will work for their effectuation. The director of one agency writes that

. . . we are able to exert considerable influence upon the decisions of county commissions and municipal councils, not through any pressures, but through logical demonstrations of sound policies benefitting the whole region. (70)

Assistance to Cooperating Agencies

Metropolitan planning agencies have established informal cooperative assistance programs for local agencies (other than cities and counties) and for State agencies, as shown in Table 9.

Fifteen agencies provide assistance to sewer, airport, and park districts, and to transportation and ports authorities. For the most part, this assistance consists of providing data, particularly on the population and economy of the metropolitan area. Two agencies provide further assistance. The Southeastern Massachusetts Regional Planning District provides staff assistance to the Area Development Corporation (industrial development) by contract. (71) The Southeastern Wisconsin

Table 9. Agencies Receiving Assistance from
Metropolitan Planning Agencies

Agency	Local Agencies Other Than Cities and Counties	State Agencies
Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission	Hospital Authority	Highway
Baltimore Regional Planning Council	Transit and Port Authorities	Highway; Health
Capital Region Planning Agency	Water-Sewer District; Flood Commission; Transit District	Highway; Agriculture; Conservation
Detroit Region Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission	Supervisors Inter-County Committee; Metropolitan Research Corporation; Area Highway Commission; Sanitation Council	Highway; Conservation; Library; Economic Development
Inter-County Regional Planning Commission	Water Board; Sewage District; Health Department	Highway; Health
Metropolitan Dade County Planning Department	Port Authority; Transit Authority; Flood District	Highways; Health
Metropolitan Planning Commission (Portland)	Sewer Authority; Basin Commission; Port of Portland	Census; Highway; Parks; Game
National Capital Regional Planning Council	Metropolitan Council of Governments	
Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission	Sanitary District	Highway; Health; Water
Regional Planning Agency of South Central Connecticut	Industrial Development Corporation	Highway; Parks
Southeastern Massachusetts Regional Planning District	Redevelopment Committee; Water Board; Industrial Development Corporation	Recreation; Education

Table 9. Agencies Receiving Assistance from
Metropolitan Planning Agencies (Continued)

Agency	Local Agencies Other Than Cities and Counties	State Agencies
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission	Sewerage; Expressways and Parks Commissions	Highway; Conservation; Economic Development; State Planning
Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission	Industrial Development Corporation; Economy League	Highway
Tri-County Planning Commission (Akron)		Highway; Natural Resources
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Lansing)		Highway; Health; Water; Aeronautics
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Peoria)	Sanitary District; Airport Authority	Highway
Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission	Airports Commission; Sanitary and Mosquito Control District	Highway, Agriculture; Health; Municipal Commission; Business Development

Regional Planning Commission aids in the establishment of the particular programs of the sewerage, expressway, and parks commissions. (72)

Sixteen agencies assist various State departments. Assistance to State highway departments has generally been provided by the agency when both are participating in the preparation of regional transportation plans. Health, recreation, and other State departments are also assisted. In general this assistance has consisted of providing information and, in some cases, preparing special studies.

Providing advisory services to local and State agencies is an important commission function. The exchange of information, plans, and reports facilitates an understanding of regional development objectives. Through these programs the planning agency staff is brought into the decision making process with officials having regional development responsibilities.

Robert Wood, Professor of Political Science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, points out in his excellent essay on the political structure of urban regions that

. . . there are few power centers which can make policies effectively tuned to the needs of the vast population changes, the revolutions in land use and the new patterns of economic development. (73)

Since there is no one power center (or government) through which the metropolitan planner can work, it is essential that he find the machinery by which he can influence the many power centers. Here the value of advisory services to governmental agencies is obvious. Wood sees the planner as a "political activist:"

Planners can proceed to exercise their influence in the organization of the new urban regions informally and politically; they can use their political resources of expertise, of information, and of articulateness, and still keep faith with a democratic ideology. (74)

Public Information and Education

Communication with local governments and residents through public information and education programs is another means of achieving area-wide cooperation. Building support for metropolitan planning through these programs is essential.

The commission staff, through its formal programs and informal

contacts, is able to make known to local governments the commission's objectives.

Providing information to citizen groups and residents is primarily a staff function. The publication of regional newsletters; public hearings; press releases; discussions with civic and business organizations; television presentations; and, annual reports are parts of the agencies' public information programs. Certain agencies, in addition, hold conferences to develop an understanding of and support for regional programs. For example, the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission held a series of conferences on regional sewerage problems prior to recommending the creation of a regional sewerage district.

(75)

Other programs serve dual purposes. The Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission brings local planners, civic leaders and government officials together at monthly luncheon meetings to which guest speakers from non-planning organizations are often invited. In addition, the Commission holds regular monthly meetings for staff members of all local planning commissions. It is difficult to estimate the effectiveness of these programs in making the planners knowledgeable of regional problems, and in making other agencies aware of the metropolitan planning programs.

Metropolitan planning agencies have generally established good public relations programs, and the value of these programs should not be underestimated. Without widespread understanding it is unlikely that the public, acting through its representatives, will support planning or needed action programs.

Local Planning Assistance

State legislative recognition of the importance of strong local planning programs to successful metropolitan planning is evident in all of the enabling acts. One director writes that:

. . . a planning constituency (is) needed--a body of local governments with active and effective planning programs which are in a position to make use of the recommendations contained in a metropolitan plan. (76)

Many agencies provide local planning assistance, which involves two programs:

- (1) providing technical planning assistance to local governments; and,
- (2) providing consultation services to local governments.

All agencies are authorized to engage in local planning assistance programs, although only the enabling legislation of the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission makes such assistance mandatory.

Technical Assistance

Technical planning assistance is provided to local governments by 13 agencies (see Table 10). Of these, ten provide this assistance by contract. Three agencies pay for technical assistance from their general funds.

Under technical assistance programs the agencies make recommendations on problems requiring immediate solution as well as preparing studies relating to the long range development of the community.

Technical assistance is provided on either a continuing or a project basis. For example, local planning for the two counties included

within the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission's jurisdiction is provided by the Commission on a continuing basis. This assistance is financed from the Commission's general funds. In addition, assistance is available for specific studies by contract. (77)

Table 10. Metropolitan Planning Agencies Offering Technical Assistance to Local Governments

Agency	Method of Payment	
	General Funds	By Contract
Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission		Yes
Inter-County Regional Planning Commission	Yes	
Joint Planning Commission: Lehigh, Northampton Counties		Yes
Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission		Yes
Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission	Yes	
Northern Virginia Planning and Economic Development Commission		Yes
Regional Planning Agency of South Central Connecticut	Yes	
Regional Planning Commission of Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Bernard Parishes		Yes
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission		Yes
Tri-County Planning Commission (Akron)		Yes
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Peoria)		Yes
Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission		Yes

Technical assistance is usually provided only if suitable financial arrangements can be made and only if personnel can be used for the work without detracting from the regional planning program.

There are several disadvantages to a metropolitan planning agency's providing technical assistance. Local governments may view the agency as a source for local planning services rather than as a body with regional planning responsibilities. Even as the agency attempts to strengthen local planning programs, local governments may view technical assistance programs as a substitute for strong local planning programs. Finally, technical assistance programs may detract from the regional planning programs. The agency may spend more on technical assistance programs than on its regional planning responsibilities. As a partial solution to this problem most agencies provide technical assistance by contract.

There are, however, some advantages to providing technical assistance through the metropolitan planning agency rather than through the State. The studies performed and plans prepared can balance local needs with regional considerations. The localities can receive greater assistance on a continuing basis. Greater freedom can be exercised in tailoring a method of financing to the needs of each community.

Consultation Services

All agencies provide consultation services to local governments. Consultation on general governmental policy and planning matters--particularly as related to regional planning objectives--is made available. Development standards for zoning, building and subdivision ordinances are prepared as guides to local governments. Methods of establishing

and using capital improvements programs are made available. The Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission, for example, acts as an advisor to bond commissions and others concerned with capital improvements in the metropolitan area.

The purpose of consultation services is to

. . . strengthen local planning efforts by providing advice and guidance, and by advising on standards and methods for planning, land use regulations, and capital improvement programs. (78)

The primary purpose of local planning assistance is to stimulate the establishment or improvement of local planning programs rather than to serve as a staff arm to them. It should not detract from the agency's regional responsibilities. For these reasons most agencies' local planning assistance programs are limited to consultation services. Providing consultation services to local governments is a necessary part of a metropolitan planning program.

Consultation services are an important means of effectuating regional policy decisions. By strengthening local planning efforts and encouraging a closer relationship between local legislative and planning bodies, the metropolitan planning agency is able to stimulate local governmental action on regional problems. Local planners are given information on regional policy required for their local planning programs. One director writes of his agency's consultation services that

Our principle objective in policy formulation at the metropolitan level . . . is to provide assistance and advice to local units of government on planning matters that are in accordance with an overall regional plan. Sound local planning, therefore, is being utilized as the basis for an effective regional program. (79)

In general, the regional planning programs are well developed,

present realistic solutions to major area-wide problems, and serve as the basis for action by local and other governments. The review of local and state plans appears to be desirable, but is not as effective in influencing regional development as are cooperative assistance programs. Half of the agencies provide limited technical assistance to local governments, usually by contract, and all agencies provide consultation services to local governments. Such services appear to be an effective means of stimulating local government action on regional problems.

CHAPTER V

METROPOLITAN PLANNING AGENCY STAFF POLICIES

This chapter is an analysis of staff policies and practices used by metropolitan planning agencies, including:

- (1) employment of agency staffs;
- (2) staff organization;
- (3) salaries; and,
- (4) employee benefits.

Employment of Agency Staffs

Twenty-one agencies have employed full-time professional staffs. The Regional Planning Agency of South Central Connecticut has employed only a part-time director.

Directors of 19 agencies are appointed by the full commission. Of these, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission and the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission appoint directors upon recommendation of their executive committees. Directors of the Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission and the Inter-County Regional Planning Commission (Denver) are appointed by executive committees. The director of the Metropolitan Dade County Department of Planning is appointed by the County Manager.

The general qualification for an executive director is that he be qualified in planning or public or business administration. Directors of most agencies are individuals with professional training and

experience in planning. The Director of the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission has professional training and experience in public administration; the Director of the Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission is a professional engineer.

Staffs of 18 metropolitan planning agencies are appointed by the director. The Bylaws of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission, for example, provide that: " . . . The director shall be responsible for employment and supervision of the Commission's staff, subject to budgets and personnel policies . . . " (80) Staffs of three agencies are appointed by the director subject to commission approval (Baltimore Regional Planning Council, Inter-County Regional Planning Commission (Denver) and Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission).

Although the commission is responsible for establishing basic policy regarding employment matters and general agency objectives, the director is held responsible for carrying out agency programs under the commission's policy direction. The director, therefore, should be free to appoint his own staff in order to fulfill his responsibilities with staff members of his own choosing.

Staffs of all but three agencies are appointed without regard to residence, requirement of examination, or other merit system requirements. With the exception of the director and senior professional personnel, staff members of the Baltimore Regional Planning Council are subject to the Maryland State Merit System; staff members of the Metropolitan Dade County Department of Planning to the Dade County Merit System; and, staff members of the National Capital Regional Planning

Council to the United States Civil Service System. The systems require competitive examinations for employment. (81)

Merit systems may assure the selection and retention of well-qualified personnel. However, due to the competition for professional planning personnel a merit system aggravates rather than improves the employment situation. Examinations are not appropriate for professional personnel. Those agencies under a merit system waive its provisions for senior level professionals. Qualified personnel are more likely to accept employment with agencies not subject to the restrictions of examinations or merit systems.

In general, qualifications for professional employment with a metropolitan planning agency are graduate education and experience in planning and related fields, and graduate education appears to be an increasingly important qualification. Over 50 per cent of the total professional personnel employed have planning education and training. Of these, about 60 per cent have graduate degrees. The second largest number of employees are those with engineering backgrounds. Of these, over 40 per cent have graduate degrees in their respective fields. Employees with other than planning backgrounds are well represented and are usually placed in positions where their skills may be particularly useful. For example, the Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission's resources planning department is directed by a geologist. Its research department is directed by a sociologist. (82)

The success of planning programs is greatly dependent upon a competent, professional staff of imaginative individuals. Organizational methods and cooperative arrangements with other agencies having develop-

ment responsibilities in the metropolitan area are important. However, a well-qualified staff can direct the planning program to the critical and important problems of regional development, and present to public officials effective solutions to area-wide problems.

Staff Organization

Staff members of metropolitan planning agencies are usually assigned to either administrative or technical planning functions.

Administration

An executive director is held responsible to the commission for all agency programs, including general administration (direction of the commission's business affairs), direction of the planning program, and public information. Directors of agencies having few employees carry out all of these functions. However, in a number of agencies, staff members assist the executive director in fulfilling his responsibilities.

Directors of eleven agencies have an assistant or planning director whom the director holds responsible for directing technical personnel engaged in plan preparation. Directors of three agencies (Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission) have a staff member assisting them in carrying out their public information responsibilities. In addition, a director usually has certain clerical assistants aiding in administrative functions. Clerical assistants and drafting aids under the director also provide clerical and drafting services for technical

personnel.

The number of administrative staff assistants required is dependent upon staff size and agency programs. However, it does appear that administrative functions can best be handled separately from technical planning functions. The time required for each is usually significant. By separating the two functions, each may be handled more effectively.

Technical Planning

Supervision of technical planning personnel--those engaged in performing studies and preparing plans--is handled in several ways. Directors of agencies with few employees supervise technical personnel as well as fulfilling their other duties. In larger agencies a planning director or assistant director usually supervises technical personnel. For example, the planning director of the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission supervises all technical personnel.

(83) When an agency uses a formal departmental structure, a department head or senior planner supervises employees assigned to his department. He is responsible to a director or assistant director.

Technical planning personnel may be assigned duties on either a project or a departmental basis. Those of eighteen agencies are assigned various responsibilities on the basis of specific projects, studies, and plans. For example, technical personnel of the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission report to the planning director for work assignments. He normally assigns a specific project to one professional staff member, who is responsible for its completion. The plan for nature preserves discussed in Chapter 4 was prepared by a professional staff member under the supervision of the planning

director. (84) Certain staff members are regularly assigned to regional planning duties and others are regularly assigned to local planning duties.

Four agencies use a formal departmental structure (Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission, Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission). Each of the four has departments of regional planning and local planning assistance. In addition, all but the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission have research departments. The Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission has a department of resources planning. This department prepares regional plans for water and water related functions--supply, flood control, and sewerage. It also prepares conservation plans for the area's resources. (85)

The division of the technical staff into a departmental structure appears to be dependent upon staff size. The Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, for example, has a staff of 83. Efficient staff operation necessitates the division of its staff into operational departments.

Table 11 shows the number of employees by agency and by function. Non-professional members include clerical and drafting aids and certain research personnel. Professional members include those with professional training and experience. This information is not comparable. Certain agencies classify an individual with limited professional education as a non-professional. Another agency may classify such an individual as a professional staff member, dependent upon his experience.

Metropolitan planning agencies have staffs of moderate size. Staff size is dependent upon agency programs, local requirements, and financial resources. An agency may rely primarily on consultants to carry out technical planning functions and employ only a director to administer its programs. Other agencies fulfill their responsibilities with their staffs. However, some lack sufficient funds to obtain the services of the professional personnel needed. In response to a question on primary agency weaknesses, a majority of agency directors listed a limited professional staff as the major weakness. The directors indicated that additional professional employees are required to adequately fulfill agency responsibilities. (86)

Salaries

Metropolitan planning agency staff positions other than the director are classified and a salary schedule established for each. The salary of a director is not usually classified, but is determined by the commission at the time of his employment. Salary schedules normally establish a starting salary for each position and periodic increases based upon months of service. For example, the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission has established the following salary schedule for its senior planner position.

<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>	<u>V</u>	<u>VI</u>	<u>VII</u>
Start	6 Months	1 Year	1-1/2 Years	2 Years	2-1/2 Years	5 Years
10,644	10,968	11,292	11,628	11,976	12,336	12,500 (87)

The total salary increase over a five-year period amounts to \$1,856. Of this amount, \$1,692 is gained in a two and one half year period.

Scheduling salary increases over a five year period is the practice used by most agencies. However, the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission and the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission base their salary schedules on a ten year period.

The salary range of each position is shown under the following categories in Table 12:

- Executive (Current Salary);
- Assistant or Planning Director;
- Senior Planner;
- Associate Planner; and,
- Research Assistant.

Salaries for clerical and drafting aids of each agency range from \$3,500 to \$5,000. Metropolitan planning agency salary schedules are similar. Any variation would appear to be due to different classification systems rather than basic differences in salary.

Salaries of agency employees are similar to those of city and county agencies. Salaries of metropolitan planning agency directors in some cases exceed those paid directors of city and county agencies. Certain agencies pay excellent salaries, particularly at the executive level, to attract outstanding professionals. Providing good salaries and establishing salary schedules--assuring periodic salary increases for satisfactory performance of responsibilities--are practices agencies must establish to compete with other governmental and private agencies for qualified personnel. Assurance of adequate and regularly increasing salaries is an important consideration to prospective employees.

Table 11. Number of Employees of Metropolitan Planning Agencies

Agency	Total	Non-Pro- fes- sional Members	Total	Professional Members By Function		
				Adminis- tration	Regional Planning	Local Planning
Atlanta Region Metro- politan Planning Commission	21	14	7	2	3	2
Baltimore Regional Planning Council	4	2	2	1	1	
Capital Region Planning Agency (Hartford)	5	3	2	1	1	
Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission	14	7	7	3	4	
Inter-County Regional Planning Commission	10	4	6	1	4	1
Joint Planning Commis- sion: Lehigh, North- hampton Counties	11	9	2	1	1	
Maryland National Capi- tal Park and Planning Commission	83	54	29	1	17	11
Metropolitan Dade County Planning Department	26	14	12	2	8	2
Metropolitan Planning Commission (Portland)	11	3	8	2	6	
National Capital Regional Planning Council	8	4	4	1	3	
Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission	26	9	17	2	12	3
Northern Virginia Plan- ning and Economic Develop- ment Commission	7	2	5	2	3	

Table 11. Number of Employees of
Metropolitan Planning Agencies (Continued)

Agency	Total	Non-Pro- fes- sional Members	Professional Members By Function			
			Total	Adminis- tration	Regional Planning	Local Planning
Regional Planning Agency of South Central Connecticut	1		1	1		
Regional Planning Com- mission of Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Bernard Parishes	4	1	3	1	2	
Richmond Regional Planning Commission	3	2	1	1		
Southeastern Massachusetts Regional Planning District	4	1	3	1	2	
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission	19	4	15	2	8	5
Southwestern Pennsyl- vania Regional Planning Commission	16	8	8	2	6	
Tri-County Planning Com- mission (Akron)	24	11	13	2	7	4
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Lansing)	16	11	5	2	3	
Tri-County Regional Plan- ning Commission (Peoria)	6	4	2	1	1	
Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission	39	18	21	4	13	4

Employee Benefits

Employee benefits include insurance, retirement programs, and leave provisions.

Insurance

Eight agencies participate in insurance programs for their employees (see Table 13). Most are comprehensive programs which include life insurance, surgical, and hospitalization coverage. An agency normally pays one-half and the employee the other half of the monthly premium. When dependents are included in insurance protection, the employee pays the additional costs. Provisions are made for policy conversion in the event an employee terminates his work with an agency.

The insurance program of the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission provides an example of the costs and benefits of insurance protection. (88) An employee earning from \$8,000 to \$10,000 may receive the following benefits:

- (1) life insurance--\$7,500;
- (2) hospitalization--\$18 a day up to 31 days per visit,
plus \$50 laboratory fees;
- (3) surgical scale--up to \$300; and,
- (4) major medical--\$10,000.

The cost to the employee is \$21.00 a month. Similar medical coverage on all dependents is available for an additional \$1.50 per month.

Employees of the National Capital Regional Planning Council are offered separate health and life insurance programs through Federal programs. They are eligible for a "service-benefit plan" for health

Table 12. Metropolitan Planning Agency Employee Salaries
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Agency	Assistant				
	Executive Director	or Planning Director	Senior Planner	Associate Planner	Research Planner
Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission	19	10-14	7-10	5-7	4-6.5
Baltimore Regional Planning Council	15		8-10	6-8	
Capital Region Planning Agency (Hartford)	12		7-9	6-8	
Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission	14	9-13	7.5-9.5	6-8	5.5-6.5
Inter-County Regional Planning Commission	14		8-10.2	6-8	5-7
Joint Planning Commis- sion: Lehigh, Northhampton Counties	12		7-9	6-8	5.5-6.5
Maryland National Capi- tal Park and Planning Commission	16	10-14	8-10	6-8	5-7
Metropolitan Dade County Planning Department	12	9-11	8-10	7-9	
Metropolitan Planning Commission (Portland)	10		8-10	7-9	6-8
National Capital Regional Planning Council	16		9-11.5	8-10	
Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission	25	15	9-11	7-9	6-8

Table 12. Metropolitan Planning Agency Employee Salaries (Continued)
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Agency	Assistant			
	Executive Director	or Planning Director	Senior Planner	Associates Research Planner
Northern Virginia Planning and Economic Development Commission	13	8-10	7-9	6-8
Regional Planning Agency of South Central Connecticut	5 (Part-Time)			
Regional Planning Commission of Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Bernard Parishes	10		7-9.5	6.5-7.5
Richmond Regional Planning Commission	10		7-9	6-8
Southeastern Massachusetts Regional Planning District	9		6-8	5-7
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission	16.6		9-11.5	7-9 6-8
Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission	16	10-14	8-10.6	7.5-10
Tri-County Planning Commission (Akron)	12	9-11	8-10	7-9
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Lansing)	12	9-11	7.8-10.5	6.5-8.0
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (Peoria)	10		7-9	6-8

Table 12. Metropolitan Planning Agency Employee Salaries (Continued)
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Agency	Assistant				
	Executive Director	or Planning Director	Senior Planner	Associates Planner	Research Planner
Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission	18	11-14	10.6-12.5	9-10.6	7.4-9.0

insurance, administered by the Blue Cross-Blue Shield organization. Benefits are paid directly to doctors and hospitals. Staff members are also eligible for life insurance. The amount of life insurance a staff member may carry is the amount of his salary raised to the upper thousand (i.e., an employee earning \$7,400 may carry \$8,000 of life insurance). The cost is \$.75 per month per \$1,000 of insurance. (89)

Retirement

Employees of nine agencies participate in retirement programs (see Table 13). One is a Federal program, five are State programs, and three are metropolitan planning agency programs.

Staff members employed less than ten years (five years for Federal employees) are not eligible for retirement program benefits. An employee working less than ten years is reimbursed for the amount he has paid into the system. Employees of agencies other than the National Capital Regional Planning Commission participate also in the Federal Social Security program.

Employees of the National Capital Regional Planning Commission

pay six and one-half per cent of their salary for retirement benefits of the Federal program. Retirement at 70 is mandatory, although employees may retire at an earlier age. Benefits are based upon years of service and upon the highest average salary earned during any five consecutive years of employment. Payments are computed in the following manner:

- (1) 7-1/2 per cent of the highest average salary; plus,
- (2) 1-3/4 per cent of highest average salary times the number of years of service over five and up to ten; plus,
- (3) 2 per cent of highest average salary times the number of years of service over ten. (90)

The Florida Pension System, in which employees of the Metropolitan Dade County Department of Planning participate, provides an example of a State retirement system. (91) Retirement at age 65 is mandatory, although an employee may retire at age 60. The employee pays 6 per cent of his salary for retirement benefits. Payments are based upon years of service and average pay of the ten years preceding retirement. For example, an employee retiring at age 65 with 20 years of service and an average salary of \$8,000 retires at \$3,200 annually. Benefits are computed by taking 2 per cent of average salary times years of service ($.02 \times \$8,000 \times 20 = \$3,200$).

The retirement plan of the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission provides an example of an agency administered system. (92) The cost of the program to an employee is 3 per cent of the first \$350 of his monthly salary and 6 per cent of his salary in excess of \$350.

Table 13. Metropolitan Planning Agency Employee Benefits

Agency	Health and Accident Insurance	Retirement Programs		
		Federal	State	Local
Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission	Yes			Yes
Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission			Yes	
Inter-County Regional Planning Commission (Denver)	Yes			
Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission	Yes			Yes
Metropolitan Dade County Department of Planning	Yes		Yes	
National Capital Regional Planning Council	Yes	Yes		
Northern Virginia Planning and Economic Development Commission			Yes	
Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission	Yes			Yes
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission	Yes		Yes	
Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission	Yes		Yes	

His contributions are matched by the Commission. Retirement at age 65 (or after ten years of service--whichever is later) is mandatory. Upon Commission approval, an employee may work to age 70. An employee may retire at age 62, but with reduced benefits. The monthly pension for an employee retiring at age 65 is equal to 23 per cent of his monthly

salary at time of retirement. For example, an employee earning \$800 at retirement receives monthly benefits of \$184. The pension is guaranteed for ten years. In the event of death before all benefits are received, a beneficiary receives the remaining amount. Life insurance protection is included in the pension plan, but may not exceed an amount 100 times greater than the anticipated monthly pension.

Leave Benefits

All agencies have established similar leave benefits. Annual leave is usually earned at a rate of one day per month. It may be carried over from one year to the next, not to exceed five days. Sick leave is usually granted on the basis of one day per month. It may be accumulated from year to year to a total of 50 days. Employees are also granted military leave and leave for legal holidays, such as July 4th and Labor Day. Leave for attending professional conventions (American Institute of Planners and American Society of Planning Officials) is usually granted, at the discretion of the agency director. In addition, most agencies pay expenses for certain staff members attending conventions. For example, the Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission pays convention expenses for its director and two other staff members selected by the director. (93)

Employee benefits are a necessary part of an agency's staff policies. They are, as are good salary schedules, important to an agency's ability to compete with other public and private organizations for well qualified personnel. Although similar leave benefits are provided by all agencies, less than half provide insurance and retirement programs. In view of the competition for professional planning person-

nel, it appears that such benefits will become increasingly important.

Directors of most metropolitan planning agencies are appointed by the Commission, and the director appoints a staff. Employees are usually assigned to either administration or to technical planning functions. Technical personnel of 18 agencies are assigned duties on a project basis, while those of four are assigned duties on a departmental basis. Metropolitan planning agencies have staffs of moderate size and pay adequate salaries based upon salary schedules. In addition, several agencies provide insurance and retirement benefits for their employees.

This study of metropolitan planning agencies has resulted in the following major findings:

- (1) most agencies were created by local governments under the provisions of State general enabling legislation;
- (2) commissions are usually composed of elected officials and citizen members representing local governments;
- (3) agencies receive their major financial support from local government payments, and from Federal 701 funds;
- (4) major expenditures are for staff salaries--primarily for regional planning;
- (5) programs identify and recommend solutions to major regional problems, and furnish consultation services to local governments;
- (6) staffs are of moderate size; and,
- (7) staff salaries generally are adequate, and a few agencies provide insurance and retirement benefits.

Individual local governments, acting independently, have been

unable to solve the political, economic, and social problems of urban regions. A new three level federal system, wherein local, State and Federal governments have certain developmental responsibilities may be able to solve many metropolitan area problems. A metropolitan planning agency can be instrumental in making this three level federal system workable.

APPENDIX

GEORGIA LAWS, 1960

(LAW 847)

A N A C T

To provide for the establishment of an Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning District for Clayton, Cobb, DeKalb, Fulton and Gwinnett Counties and the City of Atlanta, to provide for the establishment of a planning commission for said District; to provide for making and amending an over-all plan for the orderly growth and development of said District; to define the duties and powers of said commission; to define the relationship between said commission and the governing authorities inside and outside of said District and to define the rights, powers and duties of said governing authorities in respect to said commission; to provide that the recommendations of the commission shall be advisory only; to authorize the commission to provide planning services to local governments by contract; to provide for the appointment of a Metropolitan Planning Advisory Committee; to provide for the fiscal support of the commission; and for other purposes.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA, and it is hereby enacted by authority of the same as follows:

ARTICLE I

Section 1. Establishment of District. There is hereby established an Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning District, hereinafter referred to as the "district", which district shall at any time be and include all of the territorial area of as many of the following political subdivisions as shall then be participating in the fiscal support of the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission under the provisions of this Act: Clayton, Cobb, DeKalb, Fulton and Gwinnett Counties and the City of Atlanta.

ARTICLE II

Section 1. Planning Agency. There is hereby established as the planning agency for such District the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission".

Section 2. Membership of Commission. The membership of the Commission at any time shall include the representatives, mentioned below, of such of the following political subdivisions as shall then be participating in the fiscal support of the Commission:

(1) Clayton County: The Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of Roads and Revenues of such County and one other resident thereof.

(2) Cobb County: The Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of Roads and Revenues of such County and one other resident thereof.

(3) DeKalb County: The Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of Roads and Revenues of such County and two other residents thereof.

(4) Fulton County: The Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of Roads and Revenues of such County and two other residents thereof.

(5) Gwinnett County: The Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of Roads and Revenues of such County and one other resident thereof.

(6) City of Atlanta: The Mayor of the City of Atlanta and two other residents thereof.

Section 3. Appointment. The residents of each such county other than the member of the governing authority thereof shall be appointed by the Board of Commissioners of Roads and Revenues of such County, and the residents of the City of Atlanta other than the Mayor shall be appointed by the Mayor of said City.

Section 4. Terms. The terms of the chairmen of the respective County Commissions and the Mayor of Atlanta as members of the Commission shall continue as long as they shall hold such positions on the governing authority of their respective county or city. The terms of the other residents of said political subdivisions who are first appointed to the Commission shall continue until December 31, 1962. Thereafter, the terms of said other residents of said political subdivisions shall be for three years computed from January 1st of the calendar year in which such terms begin. If any political subdivision shall cease to participate in the fiscal support of the Commission, the terms of office of all of its representatives on the Commission shall thereupon expire.

Section 5. Vacancies. If a vacancy on the Commission shall occur by reason of death, resignation, change of residence or any other cause, it shall be filled for the duration of the unexpired term in the same manner as is provided in Section 2, above, of this Article.

Section 6. Appointment of Substitute Members. The chairman of the Board of Commissioners of Roads and Revenues of any county or the Mayor of Atlanta may, at his option, appoint any other person who is an elected or appointed officer of the government of said political subdivision, to serve as a member of the Commission in his place for whatever period the officer making such appointment shall determine. The Commission shall be notified in writing by the officer making such appointment, and during the period thereof said appointee shall have all of the rights, powers and privileges of the officer whose place on the

Commission he is filling. The membership of any such appointee shall, however, continue no longer than the period during which the officer making such appointment would have been eligible to serve.

ARTICLE III.

Section 1. Election of Officers and Adoption of Procedures. The Commission shall elect from its own members a chairman, vice-chairman, secretary and treasurer, any two of which offices may be held by the same person. In any given year not more than one of these officers shall be from any one participating governmental unit. The Commission shall adopt its own by-laws, rules of procedures and rules for the conduct of its business, including provision for hearings and notice thereof, not inconsistent with this Act.

Section 2. Use of Funds. The Commission shall be authorized to expend the monies provided herein for its use and monies received from all other sources for the employment of a professional staff, consultants, clerical and other assistants and other employees, for obtaining office and other necessary space, for procuring equipment, materials and supplies, and for such other purposes as the Commission shall determine to be necessary or proper to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Section 3. Compensation. No member shall receive any compensation for his services on the Commission but he shall be entitled to be reimbursed from the funds of the Commission for his necessary traveling and other expenses incurred in the work for the Commission.

ARTICLE IV.

Section 1. Books, Accounts and Annual Reports. The Commission shall keep books of account which shall be independently audited at least once in each calendar year. The auditor's report shall be presented to the governing authorities of each of the political subdivisions participating in its fiscal support.

Section 2. Fiscal Support. Funds for the use of the Commission shall be provided by the governing authorities of each of the following political subdivisions that shall elect to participate in the fiscal support of the Commission under the provisions of this Act: Clayton, Cobb, DeKalb, Fulton, and Gwinnett Counties and the City of Atlanta.

(a) Population Estimates. Each year the Commission shall make a separate estimate of the number of people who, on the first day of April of such year, resided within the following territorial areas: Clayton County, Cobb County, Gwinnett County, that portion of DeKalb County lying inside the City of Atlanta, that portion of DeKalb County lying outside the City of Atlanta, and that portion of Fulton County lying inside the City of Atlanta, and that portion of Fulton County

lying outside the City of Atlanta.

(b) Computation of Amounts Due from Respective Political Subdivisions. Based on such population estimates the governing authorities of each of the political subdivisions that shall elect to participate in the fiscal support of the Commission shall, during the calendar year next following the year in which said population estimates were made, provide the Commission with operating funds in the amount of five thousand dollars or in the amount provided for each such political subdivision in the following schedule, whichever amount is greater:

Clayton County: Twelve cents for each person residing therein plus two thousand dollars.

Cobb County: Twelve cents for each person residing therein plus two thousand dollars.

Gwinnett County: Twelve cents for each person residing therein plus two thousand dollars.

DeKalb County: Twelve cents for each person residing in said County outside the City of Atlanta, plus five cents for each person residing in said County inside the City of Atlanta, plus two thousand dollars.

Fulton County: Twelve cents for each person residing in said County outside the City of Atlanta, plus five cents for each person residing in said County inside the City of Atlanta, plus two thousand dollars.

City of Atlanta: Seven cents for each person residing therein plus two thousand dollars.

(c) Certification of Amounts Due. After the first day of April but before the first day of September of each year the Commission shall make the necessary population estimates, submit a budget, and compute the amount due from the governing authorities of each of the participating political subdivisions in accordance with the formula set forth in paragraph (b), above, of this Section and certify such population estimates and other data to each of said governing authorities.

(d) Adoption of Program and Budget. Before the first day of September each year the Commission shall, at a meeting called for the purpose, adopt a program and a budget for the next following calendar year. If the aggregate amount to be provided by the governing authorities of the participating political subdivisions in accordance with the formula set out in paragraph (b), above, of this Section is greater than is necessary for such budget, the amount to be provided by each of such governing authorities shall be reduced pro rata, and each of said governing authorities shall be notified accordingly.

(e) Funds Payable Quarterly in Advance. Each of said governing authorities shall on or before the first day of each quarter of such calendar year, furnish twenty-five per cent of the total amount to be provided by it during such year. If any such governing authority shall not have adopted its own operating budget by January 1st of such year, it shall, immediately after the adoption of its said budget, furnish the amounts then due to the Commission under the provisions of this Section.

(f) Additional Funds. The governing authority of any such political subdivision shall have the authority, during any year, to provide funds to the Commission in excess of the amount computed as provided above in this Section.

ARTICLE V.

Section 1. Master Plan. It shall be the duty of the Commission to make comprehensive surveys and studies of transportation facilities, land use, public utilities, governmental facilities and services, natural resources, and other physical, social and economic factors, conditions and trends that are relevant to the probable future development of the district, and to make and from time to time, as it may deem proper, amend, extend or add to a master plan for the orderly growth and development of the district as a whole. Such master plan and amendments, extensions and additions thereto, with the accompanying maps, plats, charts and descriptive matter, shall be furnished to the governing authorities of the political subdivisions participating in the fiscal support of the Commission and shall show the Commission's recommendations for the development of the district.

Section 2. Notice and Hearing. Before adopting a master plan, or any part thereof, or any amendment, extension or addition thereto, the Commission shall hold at least one public hearing within the territory of each participating government. At least one notice of the time and place of each such hearing shall be published, not less than seven days in advance thereof, in a newspaper of general circulation in the district. At least seven days prior notice of each such hearing shall be given in writing to the governing authority of each of the political subdivisions then participating in the fiscal support of the Commission.

Section 3. Adoption of Plan. The adoption of a master plan, or any part thereof, or any amendment, extension or addition thereto, shall be by resolution of the Commission upon the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the members thereof.

Section 4. Local Planning Commissions. This Act does not contemplate that the studies and master plan mentioned in Section 1, above of this Article shall render unnecessary the making of local studies and plans by the municipal and county planning commissions and

other planning authorities within the district.

ARTICLE VI.

Section 1. Master Plan Advisory Only. The Commission shall act in an advisory capacity only, and any master plan, or part thereof, or amendment, extension or addition thereto, adopted by the Commission shall constitute a recommendation only and shall have no binding effect on the governing authority of any political subdivision.

Section 2. Other Planning and Zoning Laws. This act shall have no effect, now or in the future, on the laws of this State conferring on municipalities and counties, and the officers, boards and commissions thereof, powers with regard to local planning and zoning and the regulation or control thereof.

ARTICLE VII.

Section 1. Contracts between Commission and Local Governments. If the governing authority of any political subdivision inside of the district shall desire plans or planning services that the Commission is not otherwise required by this Act to provide, the Commission may furnish such plans or planning services upon such terms and conditions as shall be fixed by contract between the Commission and such governing authority. In any such contract the Commission may require that payment for its services shall be made in advance. Payment for any such planning services rendered to the governing authority of any political subdivision participating in the fiscal support of the Commission under Article IV, above, shall be in addition to the amounts specified in said Article.

Section 2. Other Agencies. In carrying out the purposes of this Act the Commission shall be authorized to cooperate with, contract with, or accept funds from federal, state or local, public or semi-public, agencies, may expend such funds, and may carry out such cooperative undertakings or contracts.

Section 3. Furnishing Master Plan to Other Local Governments. The Commission may make available any master plan mentioned above, or any part thereof, or any amendment, extension or addition thereto, to the governing authority of any political subdivision not participating in the fiscal support of the Commission, whether such subdivision is inside or outside the district, upon such terms and conditions as may be fixed by agreement between the Commission and such governing authority.

ARTICLE VIII.

Section 1. Advisory Committee. The participating governments

shall appoint an Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Advisory Committee consisting of at least fifty members. The purpose of such Committee shall be to advise the Commission and act as a two-way channel of communication between the Commission and the public. The Committee's geographic representation shall be in proportion to budget funds from each participating government, in accordance with a formula to be established by the Commission. Length of membership term shall be one year. The Committee shall elect its own officers and adopt its own by-laws and rules of procedure.

ARTICLE IX.

Section 1. Effective Date of Act. This Act shall become effective on the date of its approval.

Section 2. Notice of Election to Participate. The governing authority of each of the political subdivisions mentioned in Article 1, above, shall, on or before July 1, 1960, give notice in writing to the governing authorities of each of said other political subdivisions as to whether it will participate in the fiscal support of the Commission. The governing authority of each political subdivision that shall so elect to participate shall appoint the representatives of such subdivision as provided in Article II, above, by that date. The representatives of the participating political subdivisions shall meet not later than August 1, 1960 and shall take the action necessary to elect officers and organize the Commission as provided in Article III, above.

Section 3. Property of Fulton-DeKalb Metropolitan Planning Commission. If the governing authorities of DeKalb and Fulton Counties and the City of Atlanta shall elect to participate in the fiscal support of the Commission under the provisions of this Act, the Commission, as soon as it shall be organized, shall succeed to and become owner of all of the property, records, funds and other assets of the metropolitan planning commission existing under the provisions of the Act approved February 21, 1951 (Georgia Laws of 1951, pages 3124-3130), as the same has been heretofore amended, and all of such property, records, funds and other assets shall promptly be delivered and surrendered to it.

Section 4. Termination of Fiscal Support. No governing authority of any political subdivision mentioned in Article 1, above, shall terminate its participation in the fiscal support of the Commission except at the end of a calendar year and unless it has given the Commission formal notice in writing on or before October 1st that it will not participate in such support during the next following calendar year.

Section 5. Definition of Calendar Year. The term calendar year as used in this Act shall be understood to mean the period beginning on January 1st and ending on December 31st.

Section 6. Conflicting Laws. All laws and parts of laws in con-

flict herewith are hereby repealed.

ARTICLE X.

Section 1. Notice of Local Legislation. A copy of notice of intention to apply for this local legislation and an affidavit showing the publication of such notice as required by law are attached hereto and made a part of this bill, and it is hereby declared that all the requirements of the Constitution of the State of Georgia of 1945 relating to publication of notice of intention to apply for the passage of this local legislation have been complied with for the enactment of this law.

MICHIGAN STATE LAWS, 1945

(ACT 281)

AN ACT to provide for regional planning; the creation, organization, powers and duties of regional planning commissions; the provision of funds for the use of regional planning commissions; and the supervision of the activities of regional planning commissions under the provisions of this act.

The People of the State of Michigan enact;

Terms defined. Section 1. For the purpose of this act certain terms are defined as provided in this section. Wherever appropriate the singular includes the plural and the plural includes the singular. The terms "local governmental units" or "local units" shall include cities, villages, other incorporated political subdivisions, counties, school districts, special authorities, townships, or any legally constituted governing body responsible for the exercise of governmental functions within a political subdivision of the state.

Regional planning commissions; creation. Section 2. Regional planning commissions may be created by resolution by 2 or more legislative bodies of any local governmental units desiring to create a regional planning commission.

Same; boundaries. Section 3. The boundaries of the area which are to define the limit of jurisdiction of the regional planning commission shall be established by the resolutions of the participating legislative bodies. The boundaries of this area need not be coincident with the boundaries of any single governmental subdivision or group of subdivisions which are to be included in the area, but may include all or such portions of any governmental subdivision.

Same; compensation; expenses. Section 4. No compensation shall be paid members of regional planning commissions for their services as members of the regional planning commissions: Provided, That this shall not affect in any way remuneration received by any state or local official who, in addition to his responsibilities and duties as a state or local official, serves also as a member of the regional planning commission. All members may be reimbursed for actual expenses incurred as members of the commission in carrying out the work of the commission.

Same; chairman; rules of procedure; records. Section 5. Each regional planning commission shall elect its own chairman and establish its own rules of procedure, and may create and fill such other offices as it

may determine necessary. It shall keep a record of its resolutions, transactions, findings and determinations, which records shall be a public record.

Director, etc.; appointment. Section 6. The regional planning commission may appoint a director and such employees as it may deem necessary for its work and may hire such experts and consultants for part time or full time service as may be necessary for the prosecution of its responsibilities.

Aid from governmental agencies. Section 7. Aid for the purposes of accomplishing the objectives of the regional planning commission may be accepted from all governmental agencies whether local, state or federal, if the conditions under which such aid is furnished are not incompatible with the other provisions of this act.

Advisory committees or councils, appointment. Section 8. The regional planning commission may appoint advisory committees or councils whose membership may consist of individuals whose experience, training or interest in the program may qualify them to lend valuable assistance to the regional planning commission by acting in an advisory capacity in consulting with the regional planning commission on technical and special phases of the program. Members of such advisory bodies shall receive no compensation for their services but may be reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

Research studies, etc.; development plans; advisory services; report. Section 9. The regional planning commission may conduct all types of research studies, collect and analyze data, prepare maps, charts and tables, and conduct all necessary studies for the accomplishment of its other duties; it may make plans for the physical, social and economic development of the region, and may adopt by resolution of a majority of its full membership any plan or the portion of any plan so prepared as its official recommendation for the development of the region; it may publicize and advertise its purposes, objectives and findings, and may distribute reports thereon; it may provide advisory services to the participating local governmental units and to other public and private agencies in matters relative to its functions and objectives, and may act as a coordinating agency for programs and activities of such agencies as they relate to its objectives. The regional planning commission shall make an annual report of its activities to the legislative bodies of the participating local governmental units.

Access to records, etc. Section 10. The regional planning commission shall be given access to all studies, reports, surveys, records, and all other information and material in the possession of such governmental agencies as shall be required by the regional planning commission for the accomplishment of its objectives.

Local subdivisions may adopt plans adopted by regional planning commis-

sion. Section 11. Local governmental subdivisions, whether active participants in the work of the regional planning commission or not, may adopt all or any portion of the plans prepared and adopted by the regional planning commission by following those procedures specified by act of the legislature or by local charter for the adoption of an official master plan.

Same; allocation of funds. Section 12. For the purpose of providing funds to meet the expenses of a regional planning commission any local governmental unit participating in the formation, functioning and support of the regional planning commission or any other local governmental unit wishing to contribute thereto may allocate funds for the purpose by official act of its legislative body. The proportion of the total amount of funds to be so provided by each participating local governmental unit may be suggested by the regional planning investigating committee or prepared as a proposed budget by the regional planning commission and submitted to the legislative bodies of the participating local governmental units. Each legislative body of the participating governmental units may appropriate its share of the funds to be allocated for the use of the regional planning commission by the adoption of a legislative act which is identical with a similar act or acts as adopted by the other participating local governmental units. The services of personnel, the use of equipment and office space, and the provision of special services, may be accepted from any participating local governmental unit and may be considered a part of the financial support of that governmental unit.

Gifts, grants. Section 13. The regional planning commissions may accept gifts and grants from public or private individuals or agencies if the conditions under which such grants are made are in accordance with the accomplishment of the objectives of the regional planning commission.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LITERATURE CITED

1. Urban Land Institute. "The Challenge of Metropolitan Growth," by Phillip M. Hauser, Urban Land, Vol. 17, No. 11, December, 1958, p. 3.
2. National Conference on Metropolitan Problems. General Report. Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1956, p. 9.
3. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Governmental Structure, Organization, and Planning in Metropolitan Areas: Suggested Action by Local, State, and National Governments. Washington: Government Printing Office, July, 1961, p. 10.
4. Moak, Lennox L. Some Practical Obstacles in Modifying Governmental Structure to Meet Metropolitan Problems. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1958, p. 603.
5. Gulick, Luther H. Metropolitan Problems and American Ideas. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962, p. 129.
6. Kennedy, John F. President's Message on Housing to the U. S. Congress. Washington: Government Printing Office, March, 1961.
7. U. S. Housing and Home Finance Agency. National Survey of Metropolitan Planning. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963, p. 106.
8. Ibid., pp. 2-110.
9. Ibid.
10. Oregon, Oregon Revised Statutes (1953), c. 161, sec. 190.010.
11. The Council of State Governments. State Responsibility in Urban Regional Development. Chicago: The Council, 1962, p. 49.
12. Michigan, State Laws (1945), Act 281.
13. The Council of State Governments. op. cit., p. 48.
14. Ibid., p. 49.
15. Illinois, Revised Statutes (1961), c. 34, sec. 3051-89.
16. Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission. Annual Report. Detroit: The Commission, 1962, p. 8.

17. Committee on Government Operations. Government in Metropolitan Areas: Commentaries on a Report by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Washington: Government Printing Office, December, 1961, p. 35.
18. Tri-County Regional Planning Commission. Annual Report 1963. Lansing, Michigan: The Commission, 1963, p. 8.
19. Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission. What It Is . . . What It Does. Atlanta: The Commission, 1963, p. 8.
20. Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission. Annual Report. St. Paul: The Commission, 1963, p. 14.
21. Detroit Metropolitan Area Region Planning Commission. Rules of Procedure. Detroit: The Commission, 1962, p. 3.
22. Committee on Government Operations, op. cit., p. 77.
23. Ibid.
24. Martin, Roscoe C. Metropolis in Transition: Local Government Adaption to Changing Urban Needs. Washington: U. S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, September, 1963, p. 86.
25. Institute of Public Administration. The Regional Planning Role of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. New York: The Institute, October, 1962, p. 6.
26. International City Managers' Association. Local Planning Administration, 3rd Ed. Chicago: The Association, 1959, p. 59.
27. Wisconsin, Laws (1961) 66.945.
28. Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission, op. cit., p. 14.
29. Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission. Annual Report. Chicago: The Commission, 1962, p. 19.
30. Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission, op. cit., p. 14.
31. Letter to the Author from Mr. George Nez, Director, Inter-County Regional Planning Commission, Denver, Colorado, July, 1963.
32. Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, op. cit., p. 5.
33. Institute of Public Administration. Intergovernmental Relations in the Denver Metropolitan Area. Boulder, Colorado: The Institute, 1960, pp. 86-9.
34. Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, op.

- cit., pp. 19-22.
35. Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Proposed Budget: May 1, 1963 to April 30, 1964. Silver Spring: The Commission, March, 1963, pp. 20-25.
 36. Southeastern Massachusetts Regional Planning District. Annual Report. New Bedford: The District, 1963, p. 10; and, Minnesota, Laws (1957) c. 468; and, Wisconsin, Laws (1961) 66. 945.
 37. Baltimore Metropolitan Area Study Commission. Structure of a Metropolitan Planning Agency. Stenographic Transcript of a Consultation Held in Baltimore, Maryland, September 10, 1962, p. 24.
 38. Martin, Roscoe C., op. cit., pp. 60-61.
 39. Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission, op. cit., p. 5.
 40. Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission, op. cit., p. 10.
 41. Martin, Roscoe C., op. cit., p. 68.
 42. The Council of State Governments, op. cit., pp. 48-51.
 43. National Capital Regional Planning Council. Annual Report. Washington: The Council, October, 1963, p. 12.
 44. U. S. Housing and Home Finance Agency. Urban Planning Program Guide. Washington: The Agency, August, 1963, sec. 1. 2, p. 1.
 45. _____. A Guide to Urban Planning Assistance Grants. Washington: The Agency, February, 1955, sec. 2. 12, p. 2. 55.
 46. _____. Policy Statement on Regional Planning Programs. Washington: The Agency, March, 1963.
 47. Martin, Roscoe C., op. cit., p. 73.
 48. Ibid.
 49. Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, op. cit., p. 23.
 50. U. S. Housing and Home Finance Agency. National Survey of Metropolitan Planning, op. cit., p. 74.
 51. Martin, Roscoe C., op. cit., pp. 60-61.
 52. Ibid., p. 68.

53. Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission. Policy Statement No. 6. St. Paul: The Commission, June, 1962, p. 2.
54. Ibid., p. 3.
55. U. S. Housing and Home Finance Agency. National Survey of Metropolitan Planning, op. cit., p. 17.
56. Harr, Charles M. "Regionalism and Realism in Land Use Planning," University of Pennsylvania Law Review, Vol. 105, No. 4, February, 1957, pp. 516-22.
57. Virginia, Laws (1950), c. 25, secs. 15. 891. 1 to 15. 891. 9.
58. U. S. Housing and Home Finance Agency. National Survey to Metropolitan Planning, op. cit.
59. Hayes, Robert. "Land Use and Transportation Planning." Proceedings. 46th Annual Conference, American Institute of Planners. Washington: The Institute, March, 1964, pp. 75-78.
60. Metropolitan Atlanta Transit Study Commission. A Plan and Program of Rapid Transit for the Atlanta Metropolitan Region. Atlanta: The Commission, December, 1962.
61. Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission. A Plan for Regional Nature Preserves. Atlanta: The Commission, May, 1964.
62. Martin, Roscoe C., op. cit., p. 74.
63. Opperman, Paul. "Five Years of Metropolitan Planning: A Special Report." Planning and Civic Comment, Vol. 29, No. 3, September, 1963, p. 2.
64. Ibid., p. 7.
65. Ibid., pp. 51-54.
66. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, op. cit., p. 33.
67. Committee on Government Operations, op. cit., p. 78.
68. Ibid., p. 116.
69. Ibid., p. 15.
70. Letter to the Author from Mr. Don King, Executive Director, Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, Tampa, Florida, July, 1963.
71. U. S. Housing and Home Finance Agency. National Survey of Metro-

- politan Planning, op. cit., p. 45.
72. Ibid., p. 49.
 73. American Society of Planning Officials. Planning 1962. Chicago: The Society, November, 1962, p. 7.
 74. Ibid., p. 11.
 75. Martin, Roscoe C., op. cit., p. 74.
 76. Opperman, Paul, op. cit., p. 51.
 77. Maryland National Park and Planning Commission. General Outline of Commission Functions and Duties. Silver Spring: The Commission, August, 1963, p. 42.
 78. Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, op. cit., p. 5.
 79. Letter to the Author from Mr. Keith M. Honey, Assistant Director, Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, Lansing, Michigan, October, 1963.
 80. Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission. Bylaws. St. Paul: The Commission, 1958, p. 1.
 81. Metropolitan Dade County. Employee Manual: The Key to Your Job. Miami: The County, 1957, p. 8.
 82. Letter to the Author from Mr. Paul Opperman, former Director of the Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, Chicago, Illinois, October, 1963.
 83. Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission, op. cit., p. 10.
 84. Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission. A Plan for Regional Nature Preserves, op. cit., p. 1.
 85. Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, op. cit., pp. 11-13.
 86. U. S. Housing and Home Finance Agency. National Survey of Metropolitan Planning, op. cit., pp. 23-25.
 87. Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission. Salary Schedule. St. Paul: The Commission, 1962.
 88. Interview with Mr. Glenn Bennett, Executive Director, Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission, Atlanta, Georgia, June, 1964.

89. U. S. Civil Service Commission. Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962.
90. U. S. Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Retirement System. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.
91. Metropolitan Dade County, op. cit., p. 13.
92. Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission. A Plan of Retirement for Employees. Atlanta: The Commission, 1962.
93. Detroit Metropolitan Area Region Planning Commission, op. cit., p. 5.

OTHER REFERENCES

1. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. State Legislative Program of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Washington: Government Printing Office, October, 1963.
2. Allen, J. Knight. "Metropolitan Government for Metropolitan Needs," Stanford Research Institute Journal, Vol. 4, Fourth Quarter, December, 1960.
3. Oppermann, Paul. "The Role of Metropolitan Area Planning," Planning and Civic Comment, Vol. 29, No. 4, December, 1963, pp. 41-42.
4. American Society of Planning Officials. Planning 1963. Chicago: The Society, November, 1963.
5. Baltimore Metropolitan Area Study Commission. Final Report. Baltimore: The Commission, December, 1962.
6. Bennett, Glenn E. Partnership for Metropolitan Progress. Atlanta: The Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission, 1963.
7. Colorado, Revised Statutes (1953), c. 106, art. 2-4.
8. _____. Session Laws (1953), c. 191.
9. Committee for Economic Development. Guiding Metropolitan Growth. New York: The Committee, August, 1960.
10. Committee on Government Operations. Metropolitan Planning: Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. Washington: Government Printing Office, May, 1963.
11. Connecticut, General Statutes (1958), c. 127.
12. Connery, Robert H. and Richard H. Leach. The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
13. Council of State Governments. The States and the Metropolitan Problem. Chicago: The Council, 1956.
14. Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission. Regional Planning in 1963. Detroit: The Commission, 1963.

15. _____. Staff Administrative Procedures. Detroit: The Commission, 1961.
16. Doebele, William A. The Government and Planning of Metropolitan Regions: A Proposed Conceptual Scheme. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of City Planning, University of California, 1956.
17. Georgia, Laws (1960), Law 847.
18. Institute of Public Affairs, University of Texas. Proceedings of the Texas Conference on Metropolitan Problems. Austin: The Institute, May, 1958.
19. Inter-County Regional Planning Commission. Metropolitan Growth Plan. Denver: The Commission, 1962.
20. _____. Personnel Rules and Procedures. Denver: The Commission, 1963.
21. Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems. A Discussion Guide to Washington Area Metropolitan Problems. Washington: Government Printing Office, July, 1960.
22. _____. Meeting the Problems of Metropolitan Growth in the National Capital Region. Washington: Government Printing Office, January, 1959.
23. _____. The Governing of Metropolitan Washington. Washington: Government Printing Office, December, 1958.
24. Jones, Victor. "The Organization of a Metropolitan Region," University of Pennsylvania Law Review, Vol. 105, No. 4, February, 1957.
25. Kent, T. J., Jr. City and Regional Planning for the Metropolitan San Francisco Bay Area. Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies, 1963.
26. Louisiana, Laws (1956), Act 239.
27. Maryland, Acts (1959) c. 780.
28. Maryland, Laws (1956), Art. 88c.
29. Maryland, Laws (1927), c. 448.
30. Massachusetts, General Laws (1955), c. 40B.
31. Metropolitan Dade County. Charter. Miami: The County, 1957.

32. _____. Ordinance No. 57-8, (1957).
33. Metropolitan Dade County Department of Planning. Work Program. Miami: The Department, 1963.
34. Metropolitan Planning Commission. Agreement Between Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas Counties, and the City of Portland. Portland: The Commission, 1963.
35. Metropolitan Study Commission. Report to the 1961 Legislature of the State of Wisconsin. Milwaukee: The Commission, January, 1961.
36. Meyerson, Martin. The Case for Metropolitan Planning. New York: American Council to Improve our Neighborhoods, 1961.
37. Minnesota, Annotated Statutes (1957), c. 473.
38. _____. Laws (1957), Act 468.
39. Mitchell, Robert B. Metropolitan Planning for Land Use and Transportation. Washington: Government Printing Office, December, 1959.
40. Northern Virginia Planning and Economic Development Commission. Annual Report. Arlington: The Commission, September, 1963.
41. Ohio, Revised Code (1957), sec. 713.21.
42. Pennsylvania, County Code (1961), secs. 2001-2008.
43. Ibid. (1954).
44. Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission. Bylaws. Waukesha: The Commission, 1963.
45. _____. Regional Planning Program Prospectus. Waukesha: The Commission, April, 1962.
46. _____. Annual Report. Waukesha: The Commission, 1961.
47. Tri-County Regional Planning Commission. Personnel Regulations. Lansing, Michigan: The Commission, 1961.
48. Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission. Detailed Staff Organization. St. Paul: The Commission, 1962.
49. _____. Personnel Policy. St. Paul: The Commission, 1958.
50. _____. Meeting the Challenge of Metropolitan Growth. St. Paul: The Commission, January, 1963.

51. U. S. Congress, Senate and House of Representatives. National Capital Planning Act of 1952. Washington: National Capital Planning Commission, 1963.
52. Wisconsin, General Statutes (1960), sec. 66.945.
53. Wood, Robert C. Metropolis Against Itself. New York: Committee for Economic Development, March, 1959.